37(100) C

Thinkers on education 3

Ibn KHALDŪN
KOLD
KORCZAK
KRUPSKAYA
LOCKE
MAKARENKO
MAO ZEDONG
MARTÍ
MENCIUS
MISKAWAYH
MONTAIGNE
MONTESSORI
MORE

PROSPECTS

NAIK
NEILL
NOIKOV
NYERERE
ORTEGA Y GASSET
OWEN
PESTALOZZI
PIAGET
PLATO
PRIESTLEY
AL-QABBĀNĪ
READ

Quarterly review of education

89•90

prospects

quarterly review of education

Vol. XXIV, No. 1/2, 1994 (89/90)

UNESCO

009848 19 JAN. 96

LIBRARY/BIBLIOTHEQUE

Thinkers on education

Volume 3

Editor-in-chief:

Juan Carlos Tedesco

Series editor:

Zaghloul Morsy

UNESCO Publishing /International Bureau of Education

Authors are responsible for the choice and the presentation of the facts contained in this publication and for the opinions expressed therein, which are not necessarily those of UNESCO and do not commit the Organization. The designations employed and the presentation of material in *Prospects* do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of UNESCO concerning the legal status of any country, territory, city or area or of its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers or boundaries.

Please address all correspondence to the Editor, *Prospects*, International Bureau of Education, Case postale 199, 1211 Geneva 20 (Switzerland).

UNESCO publications (books, periodicals and documents), including out-of-print titles, are available on microfiche. Please address your inquiries to: Micrographic Service, Section of Archives and Micrography (DIT/IR/AM), UNESCO, 7, place de Fontenoy, 75352 Paris 07 SP (France)

Published in 1995 by the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, 7, place de Fontenoy, 75352 Paris 07 SP (France)
Composed by ITALIQ, Bourg-en-Bresse (France)
Printed by SADAG, Bellegarde (France)

ISSN 0033-1538

© UNESCO/IBE 1994
Printed in France

Contents

Prefatory note 6
Ibn KHALDŪN *Abdelsselam CHEDDADI* 7
Christen Mikkelsen KOLD *Jens BJERG* 21
Janusz KORCZAK *Tadeusz LEWOWICKI* 37
Nadezhda Konstantinovna KRUPSKAYA *Mihail S. SKATKIN and Georgij S. TSOV'JANOV* 49
John LOCKE *Richard ALDRICH* 61
Anton MAKARENKO *G. N. FILONOV* 77
MAO Zedong *ZHUO Qingjun* 93
José MARTÍ *Ricardo NASSIF* 107
MENCIUS *GE Zhengming* 121
MISKAWAYH *Nadia GAMĀL AL-DĪN* 131
MONTAIGNE *Gérard WORMSER* 153
Maria MONTESSORI *Hermann RÖHRS* 169
Sir Thomas MORE *Keith WATSON* 185
J. P. NAIK *A. R. KAMAT* 203
Alexander Sutherland NEILL *Jean-François SAFFANGE* 217
Peter NOIKOV *Zhecho ATANASSOV* 231
Julius Kambarage NYERERE *Yusuf KASSAM* 247
José ORTEGA Y GASSET *Juan ESCÁMEZ SÁNCHEZ* 261
Robert OWEN *Peter GORDON* 279
Johann Heinrich PESTALOZZI *Michel SOËTARD* 297
Jean PIAGET *Alberto MUNARI* 311
PLATO *Charles HUMMEL* 329
Joseph PRIESTLEY *Ruth WATTS* 343
Isma'il AL-QABBĀNĪ *Mahmud KOMBAR* 355
Herbert READ *David THISTLEWOOD* 375
Contributors to this volume 391
Thinkers on education in this series 399

Prefatory note

This is the third volume (Ibn Khaldūn to Read) of our four-volume series of Prospects containing a total of 100 monographs on 'Thinkers on education'. The whole series will cover the issues of Prospects scheduled for 1993 and 1994 in the form of four double issues, namely: nos. 85/86, 87/88, 89/90 and 91/92.

For a thorough analysis of the reasons for this series, the selection of famous educators, the order of presentation and the intended readership, readers are referred to the introduction written by Zaghloul Morsy, 'The Paideia Galaxy', which appeared in no. 85/86.

A complete list of the thinkers on education appearing in this series, together with the names of the contributors, is given at the end of this issue.

The editorial preparation of this issue has been undertaken by the staff of the International Bureau of Education, Geneva, Switzerland.

IBN KHALDŪN[1]

(A.D. 1332–1406/A.H. 732–808)

Abdesselam Cheddadi

At first sight, the place held by education in Ibn Khaldūn's sociology appears uncertain to say the least. What today we understand by the term 'education' – the replication of individuals and groups, firstly at the level of values and secondly at that of knowledge and know-how – is found in the *Muqaddima* [Introduction to History] only in a scattered and incomplete fashion, in an order and pattern whose meaning escapes us at first sight. More important, Ibn Khaldūn makes no use of a general concept in speaking of education. This is all the more surprising as he accustoms us elsewhere to a systematic approach to the main phenomena of life in society. However, upon closer view we discover that this ambiguity and these lacunae in fact reflect the state of the Muslim system of education, and we are forced to admit that, in this field as in many others connected with the knowledge of Muslim society, Khaldūn's contribution is the most complete at our disposal.

The education system in Muslim societies

The education system in Muslim societies was without a doubt one of the most extensive and most developed of all those prevailing in pre-industrial societies, which was due to the very nature of Muslim society itself. Compared with agro-literate societies contemporary with it, Muslim society stands out for its more flexible and less hierarchically organized structures. The body composed of scholars and the literati was open, non-centralized, non-hereditary, non-exclusive, with a fluid organization that implied no formal hierarchy,[2] thus giving rise to a relatively broad education and teaching system that in many ways prefigured our modern systems.[3]

Like the society itself, the education system was both segmented and unified. It was a reflection of the profound separation between the rural and urban worlds: agrarian or agro-pastoral communities of peasants and stock-breeders on the one hand, and an urban society of merchants, artisans, clerics and State civil

servants, on the other. And, at the same time, it was unified by the common adherence to Islam, identification with which was tangibly represented by the universal Koranic teaching that was virtually obligatory for all. Although education was informal and imparted by the family and the community in rural areas and among the urban poor, there was formal schooling for the children of the mercantile, clerical and political élite. Children were frequently placed under a tutor or received longer, more diversified instruction in a school that went well beyond the teaching of the Koran and the rules of religious practice. Independently of this education of children and without any structural connection between the two, there was also vocational teaching to prepare the learned for various professions. Theoretically available to all, covering all fields of knowledge both ancient and Muslim, homogeneous in its methods, it came to form part of institutions only on a partial basis and at a late date.[4] It is within this educational setting that the *madrasa* (college), the model of the medieval university in France and Italy and of the English 'college'[5] – which was later to give rise to the modern university – came into being.

This basic education, religious above all, and this system of the replication of scholars, was paralleled by what could be called a system of general adult instruction. In Islamic thought, education, which here takes in religion and morals, is a process that ends at no determined stage or age but lasts an entire lifetime, as expressed in the saying attributed to the prophet Muhammad: 'Learn science from the cradle to the grave.' Such figures as that of the literate man (*adib*), the pious man, the fakir or dervish, and that of the burgher or governor consorting with the learned, so typical of Muslim society, owed a great deal to this system of general instruction based on such institutions as the mosque or the zaouia, and carried forward by such people as the sermon-writer (*khatib, wa 'iz*), the poet, the religious reformer or the saint, and by a vast literature of popularizations made up of literary anthologies, encyclopedias, local or general histories, biographical dictionaries, pious works, mystical treatises, etc.

The educational and cultural Islamic system led to the production of an abundant literature setting forth its organization and functioning, analysing its standards and values. Philosophers such as al-Fārābi[6] and Miskawayh[7] proposed a theory of education whose end was to allow human beings to reach the perfection proper to their nature. At another level, al-Mawardi[8] proposed an education programme reconciling wordly and religious interests, and al-Ghazālī,[9] in his celebrated *Ihya' 'ulūm al-dīn* [The Revival of the Religious Sciences], formulated a theoretical basis and devised a practical method for attaining the religious ideal of the good Muslim. All these educational theories, in line with a tradition that goes back to Graeco-Roman antiquity, are interested in the human being per se, considered in every aspect of his or her being. They do not concentrate on a particular stage of human life or a particular type of instruction or institution; they lay down a number of fundamental educational principles, albeit in a subsidiary and cursory manner: the restrained use of authority and corporal punishment, the need to awaken the child's interest, the value of example, and progression in

learning. Above all, they insist on the importance of the pedagogical relationship and define the respective roles and duties of master and student.

Thus, in Islamic thought, education was perceived as a matter that, during infancy, devolved upon the family, especially the father, whereas in adulthood it became the individual's own responsibility. Yet no clear awareness of a unified system of education as a fundamental component of the social system bringing together all aspects of the replication of individuals and groups had come into being. The accent was placed rather on the individual soul, which had to be corrected (*taqwīm*), improved (*tahdhīb*), reformed (*islāh*) and healed of its sickness (*mudāwāt*). General concepts such as *ta'dīb* (educate) or *ta'līm* (instruct) concerned individuals and comprised acts or relations involving person-to-person relationships. There was no generic term designating education as a social institution or the education system as a set of institutions, practices and items of knowledge, which in any case was not specific to Muslim society. Such a concept, together with the reality behind it, is closely linked to the emergence of modern nations and States, one of whose principal duties is in fact to manage and develop education.[10]

THE REPRODUCTION OF VALUES

Faithful to the general position he takes in the *Muqaddima*, that of a 'science of human society' (*'ilm al-ijtima' al-insānī*), Ibn Khaldūn approaches education neither as a philosopher, a religious thinker, a moralist or as a jurist – the four approaches adopted by Muslim thinkers who considered the phenomenon of education – but as a sociologist and historian. Yet, while his approach faithfully reflects the fundamental structural features of the Islamic education system (separation of the rural world from the urban world, discontinuity between the training of the person and training for a trade, and the cowardly and badly structured character of educational institutions), it does not apprehend the education system as forming a whole. The aspects of education that we would today classify under the reproduction of values are scattered throughout those chapters of the *Muqaddima* devoted to social organization and dynamics, power, and rural and urban ways of life. On the other hand, the aspects involving training, knowledge and know-how are brought together in the two successive chapters dealing with the arts and sciences.

The well-known concept of *'asabiyya*, generally rendered as *esprit de corps*, solidarity or cohesion, is rarely seen other than from the sociological standpoint. But it is also concerned with the world of values. It may even be said that this concept is the underlying value in tribal society, as it is the source of all forms of cohesion in a society organized according to an interlocking principle. The foundations of *'asabiyya* are what Ibn Khaldūn calls *nu'ra* (kinship), the feeling of affection for, and attachment to, close relatives and all who are of the same blood.[11] When a relative suffers an injustice or is attacked, one feels humiliated and leaps to his or her defence in the same natural reflex that causes one to reci-

procate aggression against oneself. Ibn Khaldūn calls it a natural tendency that has always existed in human beings. It transmits itself spontaneously from one generation to the next and needs to be neither learned nor taught. It is to be found at the deepest level of a sort of instinct of preservation. But Ibn Khaldūn admits that the relations that people are forced to maintain between themselves out of vital necessity are orderly and obey rules and laws. One of the functions of thought is to 'allow people to acquire, through their dealings with their fellows, knowledge of what they must do and what they must not do, of what is good and what is evil'.[12] Thanks to 'empirical intelligence', individuals are capable of discovering for themselves the rules and values that must guide their acts and their social life; but, as Ibn Khaldūn points out, this would take too much time, 'as everything that depends on experience requires time'.[13] A much shorter way lies in imitating one's parents, teachers and elders in general. Ibn Khaldūn thus poses the problem of the reproduction of values at the most general level, placing himself at the point of view of the individual, however, not that of society, without considering the social function of the reproduction of values as such. He fails here to disengage himself from a general attitude we find in philosophers, religious thinkers and moralists, one that might be called 'edifying'. Individual improvement and salvation are the aims here, requiring the acquisition of certain forms of behaviour and the assimilation of certain rules and values. Ibn Khaldūn does not state exactly which ones, but it can safely be affirmed that he means here what Muslim thinkers commonly call the *ādāb*, ways of doing, social conventions or rules of behaviour. The *ādāb* reach into all fields of human activities and behaviour. They have been codified down to the smallest details, as can be seen in al-Mawardi and al-Ghazālī, forming a part of that broad, permanent moral and religious mechanism for human education referred to above.

In other respects, Ibn Khaldūn adopts an approach that could without hesitation be described as sociological. It can be illustrated by three examples – examples in which he analyses the courage of rural folk, the corruption of urban dwellers and the phenomenon of imitation.

Courage is a cardinal virtue among country people, he observes. They have neither militia nor walls nor gates. They see to their own defence, bearing arms and keeping themselves on the alert at all times. In them, therefore, 'daring has become a character trait, and courage second nature'. Among townsmen, however, this virtue is nearly absent since they are brought up in a state of dependence, sheltered behind their walls and protected by their militia and their governors; they are used to peace and comfort. In addition, their spirits are weakened and their courage annihilated by the weight of the constraints imposed on them by 'governmental and educational laws'.[14]

Corrupt morals are virtually inescapable for urban dwellers. An affluent life leads to the search for pleasure, the appearance of new habits and of new needs. These become increasingly difficult to satisfy, particularly when dynasties decline and taxes become heavier. Townspeople use any means, good or bad, to cope, ineluctably entering 'the ways of immorality'.[15] In rural areas, on the other hand,

a life of making do with the bare necessities constantly calls for control over appetites. The vices and defects that can be acquired are few compared to those of townspeople, and countrypeople remain close to their original natural state and are more inclined to good.[16]

Imitation is held by Ibn Khaldūn to be a general phenomenon: the dominated always imitate those who dominate them. This is true of children *vis-à-vis* their parents, pupils *vis-à-vis* their teachers, subjects *vis-à-vis* their princes and dominated nations *vis-à-vis* dominant nations; it holds true as much for custom and behaviour as for all aspects of civilization. Ibn Khaldūn finds the explanation for this phenomenon in the fact that the dominated believe in the perfection of those who dominate them.[17]

In all three examples, the question of values and their transmission is no longer presented as an exclusively individual matter. The courage of rural folk, like the corrupted morals of townspeople and the phenomenon of imitation, do not depend only on subjective will, nor are they the result of incitement: they are the outcome of actual conditions.

As can be seen, without stating the matter explicitly or systematically, Ibn Khaldūn deals with all aspects of the reproduction of values in Muslim society. He begins by assuming, in a sort of philosophical anthropological postulate, that human beings, who are endowed with the faculty of thought, organize their relations with the world and each other according to laws and rules that each individual learns through his or her own personal experience, and especially by impregnation from the family and cultural milieu. At the same time, he reveals deeper, more underlying values, connected with the very functioning of society, whose reproduction occurs independently of individual wills.

Lastly, it is important to note that Ibn Khaldūn brings up twice, although both times in an incidental manner, the matter of the inculcation of religious values. Speaking of the consequences of Koranic instruction on mental development, he points out that it has become 'the symbol of Islam in all Muslim cities', as it allows articles of faith to be inculcated in the heart of the child from the tenderest age. In his analysis of the methods practised in the various regions of the Muslim world, he stresses the 'total' linguistic 'deficiency' to which precocious Koranic instruction leads, particularly when it is unique and exclusive, as it was in North Africa. He approves, at least in theory, of the reforms proposed by Abū Bakr Ibn al-'Arabī, whereby the child would first be taught language and the rules of calculation, but he finds that such ideas clash with habits too deeply ingrained to allow those ideas to be implemented,[18] thereby confirming one of the structural features of the Islamic education system, namely that of the basically religious nature of the instruction given to children and of the discontinuity between that instruction and the training of scholars. Moreover, when examining the matter of faith and works in the chapter he devotes to theology, Ibn Khaldūn gives a personal interpretation of it based on his theory of *habitus* (*malaka*, see 'Learning the Arts' below). In substance, he says that what is required in faith and works is not just a formal declaration or mechanical gesture but a 'know-

ledge of state', a 'permanent disposition', an 'indelible colouring' of the soul.[19] The essential task of the religious institution is to lead the individual towards such a realization. Ibn Khaldūn leaves it up to men of religion to determine and describe the exact practical rules and procedures.

TRAINING ON KNOWLEDGE AND KNOW-HOW

Ibn Khaldūn deals with the learning of trades and the teaching of the sciences in connection with the 'means of existence' argument and the general table of the sciences of his time drawn up in the last and very long chapter of the *Muqaddima*. It is not certain that he would agree with our reconciliation of the two, since he sees technology as a field of knowledge and of thought linked to action and consequently inferior to science, which is pure speculation.

In Ibn Khaldūn's theory of society, the development of the arts (i.e. the trades, in the language of the period) and the sciences corresponds at the human level to the perfection of the spiritual nature and at the social level to the final stage of the gradual transition of society from the rural order to the urban order. The gulf between the rural and urban worlds is perceived as a natural consequence of the passage from the 'necessary' to the 'superfluous', from the 'simple' to the 'complex'. Rural society, being satisfied with the necessary, cultivates only the simplest of the arts, such as agriculture and weaving; it has no knowledge of writing and the sciences, and though at times some of its members may take an interest in such matters, they can never reach perfection.[20] In the cities, the arts and sciences develop as production expands and diversifies, as wealth increases and as a taste for the superfluous and luxury comes into being.[21]

The term 'art' (*sināʿa*) is used by Ibn Khaldūn in a very wide acceptation, covering even the vocational and practical aspects of scientific activities. The various arts, presented in relation to 'the means of existence', are classed according to their uses and their social importance before more systematic exposés are made on the main ones. The religious and intellectual offices, such as those of the judge, the mufti or the teacher, are placed on the same level as the other arts considered as 'means of existence'. But, as Ibn Khaldūn points out,[22] though these are 'noble' as to their ends, they are generally poorly paid.

LEARNING THE ARTS

Ibn Khaldūn limits himself here to two remarks: the arts must necessarily be learned from a master; they are highly specialized, and a person who masters one art cannot generally master a second. He does not conceive of technology as a body of knowledge independent of those who possess it. Technique, though understood as something at once practical and intellectual (*amr ʿamalī fikrī*), is reduced to a skill that may be learned only by observation and imitation (*naql al-muʿayana*). Learning itself is seen by Ibn Khaldūn as the acquisition of a *habitus* (*malaka*). He uses this concept, which for philosophers[23] had an essentially moral

and intellectual meaning, very widely to cover a vast field going from language to faith, the arts and the sciences. He defines it as 'a stable quality resulting from a repeated action until its form has taken final shape'.[24] *Habiti* are like gradually formed 'colours' of the soul. They take shape when a person is still in his or her 'state of natural simplicity'. Once the soul acquires a given aptitude it loses its primary simplicity, its readiness weakens and its capacity to assimilate a second aptitude diminishes. We shall return to this important concept later.

THE TEACHING OF THE SCIENCES

The ideas developed by Ibn Khaldūn on teaching belong to his encyclopedic presentation of the sciences. This opens with a theory of knowledge and a general presentation of the socio-historical and epistemological bases of scientific development. Then the sciences, categorized as the rational – 'those that people can apprehend by virtue of the very nature of thought'[25] – and the traditional – 'those founded upon authority'[26] – are described as to their subjects, their methods, their results and their historical development. Teaching is approached at the end of this enumeration and before the sections on language, the learning of language and the various forms of literary production. Two sides can be distinguished to Ibn Khaldūn's presentation, one covering the principles of teaching, the other its methods and content. The learning of language is dealt with separately.

CONDITIONS FOR TEACHING

According to Ibn Khaldūn, at birth we are entirely devoid of knowledge; we are still no more than 'raw material'. We then gradually gain 'form' 'thanks to the knowledge we acquire through our organs'. Essentially ignorant, we fulfil ourselves as human beings only through knowledge. Ibn Khaldūn distinguishes three types of knowledge corresponding to as many 'degrees of thought'. There is practical knowledge, the product of 'the discerning intelligence', which allows us to act in the world in a controlled fashion; then 'a knowledge of what we must or must not do and of what is good or evil', which we acquire through our 'empirical intelligence' and which guides us in our relations with our fellows; and, lastly, theoretical knowledge of everything that exists in the world, which we conquer by our 'speculative intelligence'. Only this last type of knowledge, the subject of the sciences, gives us the possibility of reaching perfection of soul.[27]

The teaching of the sciences is necessary for two reasons: firstly, thorough knowledge of them requires a lengthy period of learning that can be carried out only with the help of teachers;[28] secondly, their very development requires them to be communicated to others.

PEDAGOGICAL PRINCIPLES

Ibn Khaldūn's pedagogical conception is based on the central concept of the *habitus*, mentioned earlier in connection with the learning of the arts. Whether it concerns the child or the adult, the practical arts or the sciences, moral or religious values, the aim of all pedagogical action is the formation in the soul of a stable disposition. Once it has been acquired, this disposition will not disappear. Ibn Khaldūn often compares it to a dye that lasts until the cloth to which it has been applied is destroyed.

All *habiti*, says Ibn Khaldūn, are necessarily corporal. He understands the *habitus* as something the soul can acquire only through the senses, as opposed to another type of knowledge proper to the prophets and mystics, which can be obtained only through the contemplation by the soul of its own essence. This concerns both the physical and the intellectual aptitudes, starting with the very fact of thinking.[29] The formation of a *habitus* initially requires continuous repetition until the form is fixed. In order to obtain maximum efficiency, it must be a practice (*bi-l-mubāshara*) and modelled on the most perfect exemplars with the help of the best teachers, preferably following methods of direct observation (*bi-l-mu 'āyana*). Ibn Khaldūn thinks that the soul has but fairly limited receptivity (*isti 'dād*). For one thing, it cannot receive several 'dyes' at a time; then, when it has taken on one of these, its capacity to receive others gradually diminishes.[30] Training must thus start from the earliest age, when the soul is still virgin, 'because the first things to be imprinted into hearts are like foundations for the *habitus*; and the building's value is determined by that of its foundations'.[31] Accordingly, the choice of content in the earliest instruction is of decisive importance. Moreover, in the field of the arts as well as of the sciences, Ibn Khaldūn advises strictly against the teaching of more than one subject at a time. Moreover, he points out, observation shows us that 'it is rare to find a person skilled in one art who is then capable of excelling in another and to the same degree'.[32]

Ibn Khaldūn calls attention to another important factor in the formation of *habiti*, namely that of authority. An overly severe attitude on the part of the teacher leads to the most harmful consequences, particularly for young children. In this connection, he cites the situation of slaves, servants and oppressed nations. Constraint and oppression break the character, sap energy and in the end destroy their subjects' capacity for realizing 'their destiny and their full humanity'.[33] He therefore recommends moderate use of authority and punishment, taking into consideration the personality of the pupil and the need 'to instruct without afflicting the pupil and killing his or her spirit'.

Finally, *habiti* can be either good or bad; they may take the form of either virtue or vice, good or evil, good taste or bad, refinement or crudeness, clarity and exactness or confusion. They also differ in degree, depending on the quality of teaching and of the models imitated and on the general level of development of the civilization.

Methods and contents

Ibn Khaldūn approaches the question of the teaching of the sciences from his concept of the *habitus*. In order to master any discipline and fully possess it, he says, it is necessary to acquire 'a *habitus* that allows the principles and rules to be grasped, problems to be fully understood and secondary questions to be drawn from principles'.[34]

The formation of such a *habitus* demands a rigorous approach in which must be taken into consideration the student's 'receptivity' and power to assimilate, together with the quantity of information contained in the subject to be taught and its complexity. Ibn Khaldūn considers that the process must take place in three progressive stages, whose object and means he is careful to explain.[35]

The first of these is a preparatory stage. Its object is to familiarize the student with the subject being taught and to prepare him or her to grasp its problems. This stage is limited to giving an overall view of the subject and emphasizing its main points. Explanations must be kept simple and general and allow for the student's capacity for understanding and assimilation.

The second stage goes deeper. Now the subject must be looked at from every angle and generalizations transcended. Explanations and commentaries must be exhaustive and all divergent points of view examined.

The third stage is that of consolidation and mastery. The subject is again studied, in extenso, from the beginning, but this time the most complex and obscure points are gone into.

Ibn Khaldūn lays great emphasis on the principle of the progressive approach. He says it is a serious error to begin by the most abstruse problems, as do many teachers who take no account of the student's state of preparation. Such a practice is most harmful, as the student tires rapidly and becomes discouraged. Worse still, in the belief that the difficulties encountered are intrinsic to the subject, the student turns away from it and abandons it. Going further into the matter, Ibn Khaldūn perceives clearly that the inculcation of a body of knowledge is inseparable from the development of the mental aptitudes necessary for that knowledge to be assimilated. As he points out:

> At the beginning the student is literally incapable of understanding anything at all, except for a very few points that, in any case, he or she grasps only in an approximate and summary manner, when they are explained with examples drawn from sensory experience. Then the student's readiness gradually develops: the problems of the subject become more familiar with every repetition, and he or she then goes from approximate knowledge to an ever deeper assimilation.[36]

Ibn Khaldūn supplements these general principles with a number of practical recommendations. He recommends to teachers that they present their students with consistent teaching material suited to their capacities, keeping to the works selected for the course and seeing to it that they are completely assimilated before

passing on to others; not teaching two subjects at the same time; not stretching out the study of a subject over too long a period, in order not to break the interdependence between its different facets. He advises students not to 'dwell on disputes over words' and especially not to weigh themselves down with formal logic. 'Indeed,' he says, 'the only natural means of attaining truth is the natural readiness to think, once it is relieved of all false ideas and the thinker places his or her entire confidence in divine mercy. Logic is nothing more than a description of the act of thinking and in most cases follows it.'[37]

On the question of the content of science teaching, Ibn Khaldūn limits himself to a few remarks inspired by the actual state of education in his time. He denounces three abuses: the overload of work imposed on students; the excessive importance given to the 'instrumental sciences'; and the use of précis. The sciences, particularly religious and literary science, had undergone considerable development under Islam, and Ibn Khaldūn describes it in detail. In agreement with his contemporaries, he judges this development to have reached its apogee and its term.[38] How and in what form should the enormous accumulated corpus be transmitted? During the preceding centuries, sustained efforts had been made to devise adequate didactic forms: syntheses, treatises, précis and commentaries. For each subject there was a plethora of works available. Each school of thought or trend had its own collection, often with methods and terminologies that were peculiar to it. Ibn Khaldūn wondered how the average student could be required to assimilate it all. Teachers, he suggests, should limit themselves to teaching their students the subject-matter of their own schools. But he barely believes in this solution himself, 'owing to force of habit'. Précis do not seem to him to furnish an effective remedy; on the contrary, they only increase the harm done. Intended to 'facilitate memorization for students, they render the task harder for them'. Ibn Khaldūn makes two reproaches: by trying to 'fit a maximum number of ideas into a minimum number of words', they are injurious to the quality of expression and lead to comprehension difficulties; and they sow confusion in the students' minds 'by presenting them with the ultimate findings of a subject before preparing them to take in those findings'.[39] Faced with such a situation, it is understandable that he should speak out against the propensity of his age to dwell on the study of the sciences described as 'auxiliary' or 'instrumental' – such as grammar, logic and legal principles. These are theoretically only means to be placed at the service of the fundamental sciences that are sought for their own sakes. Thus, philology and arithmetic should serve the religious sciences, while logic and philosophy should be similarly available to theology. Too much time spent on the religious sciences is only further weighing down the burden borne by students and distracting them from the essential.[40]

This view of education is not seen by Ibn Khaldūn as being linked to institutions or places. It appears rather as a private, individual matter at the level of each of its three components: science, teachers and students. The individual soul fulfils itself in and through knowledge. The invention and development of the sciences meets a spiritual necessity above all. Although perfectible, the sciences

are conceived as constituting a closed universe, or at least one tending towards a certain completion. The greater part of scientific activity must be devoted to the task of organizing the various fields of knowledge into individualized subjects capable of being transmitted. Thus, of the objects assigned by Ibn Khaldūn to 'the composition of works', five out of eight deal with organization and the transmission of knowledge: definition of the subject, the systematic exposé of results, the righting of errors, commentary and summary.[41]

With the progress of civilization, science became professionalized, organizing itself according to principles and rules, making use of a specialized methodology and terminology; it was practised as a trade. When Ibn Khaldūn attempts to trace out a history of education, he concentrates on the *sanad*, that is, the network of teachers, across space and time, who guarantee the quality of the knowledge transmitted. Moreover, the history of the sciences is essentially epitomized for him in that of the basic works that have been composed within each subject, with their main commentaries and abstracts. Thus, on the one hand, and within each subject, there are a number of established works; on the other, chains of authorities to transmit them: this sums up the institution of education. Ibn Khaldūn barely mentions such places as colleges (*madrasa*) or convents (*khānqas*, *rubūt*), which he considers only in the role of material assistance to students and teachers (board and lodging).[42] Thus, indirectly and several centuries in advance, he confirms one of the invariable structural features of the education system in Muslim societies, namely the precarious nature of its institutions.

Notes

1. The author's original title was 'Education in Ibn Khaldūn's *Muqaddima*'.
2. See E. Gellner, Nations and Nationalism, pp. 11-18, 29-35, Oxford, Basil Blackwell, 1983.
3. See G. Makdisi, *The Rise of Colleges*, Edinburgh, Edinburgh University Press, 1981; *The Rise of Humanism in Classical Islam and the Christian West*, Edinburgh, Edinburgh University Press, 1990.
4. See H. J. Cohen, *The Economic Background and Secular Occupations of Muslim Jurisprudents and Traditionists in the Classical Period of Islam (until the Middle of the Eleventh Century)*, Journal of Economic and Social History of the Orient (Leiden, Netherlands), January 1970, pp. 16-61; J. E. Gilbert, *The 'Ulama of Medieval Damascus and the International World of Islamic Scholarship*, Ann Arbor, University Microfilms, 1977 (Ph.D. dissertation).
5. Makdisi, op. cit.
6. See particularly *Arā' ahl al-madīna al-fādila* [The Opinions of the Inhabitants of the Virtuous City] and *Kitāb tahsīl as-sa 'āda* [The Book of the Attainment of Happiness]. A profile of al-Fārābī is included in this series of '100 Thinkers on Education'.
7. See *Kitāb tahdhīb al-akhlāq* [Treatise on Ethics].
8. See *Ādāb ad-dunyā wa-d-dīn* [The Rules of Propriety for the Wordly Life and the Religious Life].

9. A profile of al-Ghazālī is included in this series of '100 Thinkers on Education'.
10. Gellner, op. cit., pp. 35–38.
11. See *Muqaddima Ibn Khaldūn*, Vol. 2, pp. 484-85, Cairo, 'Abd al-Wahid Wafi, undated. (French translation by Vincent Monteil, Vol. 1, pp. 256-58; English translation by F. Rosenthal, Vol. 1, pp. 264-65, hereafter designated as FT and ET. In some cases, the French translation is incomplete.) All quotations from the *Muqaddima* given in the present essay were translated from Arabic into French by the author.
12. *Muqaddima*, op. cit., Vol. 3, pp. 1012-13; FT, Vol. 2, pp. 878-80; ET, Vol. 2, pp. 417-19.
13. Ibid., Vol. 3, p. 1012; FT, Vol. 2, p. 878; ET, Vol. 2, p. 418.
14. Ibid., Vol. 2, pp. 478-81; FT, Vol. 1, pp. 249-54; ET, Vol. 1, pp. 257-61.
15. Ibid., Vol. 2, pp. 888 ff.; FT, Vol. 2, pp. 765 ff.; ET, Vol. 2, pp. 291 ff.
16. Ibid., Vol. 2, pp. 474-79; FT, Vol. 1, pp. 246-51; ET, Vol. 1, pp. 253-58.
17. Ibid., Vol. 2, pp. 510-11; FT, Vol. 1, pp. 291-92; ET, Vol. 1, pp. 290-300.
18. Ibid., Vol. 3, pp. 1249-53; FT, Vol. 3, pp. 1222-26; ET, Vol. 3, pp. 300-05.
19. Ibid., Vol. 3, pp. 1072 ff.; FT, Vol. 3, pp. 965 ff.; ET, Vol. 3, pp. 39 ff.
20. Ibid., Vol. 2, pp. 935, 961; FT, Vol. 2, pp. 816, 847; ET, Vol. 2, pp. 346, 378.
21. Ibid., Vol. 2, pp. 936-39; FT, Vol. 2, pp. 817-19; ET, Vol. 2, pp. 347-49.
22. Ibid., Vol. 2, pp. 925-26; FT, Vol. 2, pp. 805-07; ET, Vol. 2, pp. 334-35.
23. See, for example, Avicenna in Shifā'.
24. *Muqaddima*, Vol. 2, p. 935; FT, Vol. 2, p. 816; ET, Vol. 2, p. 346.
25. Ibid., Vol. 3, pp. 1025-26; FT, Vol. 2, p. 897; ET, Vol. 2, p. 436.
26. Ibid.
27. Ibid., Vol. 3, pp. 1008-09; FT, Vol. 2, pp. 873-75; ET, Vol. 2, pp. 411-13.
28. Ibid., Vol. 3, pp. 1017-18; FT, Vol. 2, pp. 887-88; ET, Vol. 2, pp. 424-426.
29. Ibid., Vol. 3, p. 1019; FT, Vol. 2, p. 889; ET, Vol. 2, p. 426.
30. Ibid., Vol. 2, p. 942; FT, Vol. 2, pp. 824-25; ET, Vol. 2, p. 354-55.
31. Ibid., Vol. 3, p. 1249; FT, Vol. 2, p. 1222; ET, Vol. 2, p. 301.
32. Ibid., Vol. 2, p. 942; FT, Vol. 2, pp. 824-25; ET, Vol. 2, pp. 354-55.
33. Ibid., Vol. 3, pp. 1253-54; FT, Vol. 3, pp. 1226-29; ET, Vol. 3, pp. 305-07.
34. Ibid., Vol. 3, p. 1019; FT, Vol. 2, p. 888; ET, Vol. 2, p. 426.
35. Ibid., Vol. 3, pp. 1243-45; FT, Vol. 3, pp. 1218-21; ET, Vol. 3, p. 292-94.
36. Ibid.
37. Ibid., Vol. 3, p. 1248; ET, Vol. 3, p. 298.
38. Ibid., 3, p. 1027; FT, Vol. 2, p. 901; ET, Vol. 2, p. 439.
39. Ibid., Vol. 3, p. 1242; FT, Vol. 3, p. 1217-18; ET, Vol. 3, p. 291.
40. Ibid., Vol. 3, pp. 1248-49; ET, Vol. 3, p. 298-300.
41. Ibid., Vol. 3, pp. 1237-40; FT, Vol. 3, pp. 1211-14; ET, Vol. 3, pp. 284-88.
42. Ibid., Vol. 3, pp. 1021, 1025; FT, Vol. 2, pp. 892, 897; ET, Vol. 2, pp. 430, 435.

Works by Ibn Khaldūn

IN ARABIC

Kitab al-'Ibar [The Book of Advice]. Ed. by N. Hurini. 7 vols. Cairo, Bulaq, 1867 (a.h. 1284).

Muqaddima Ibn Khaldūn [Ibn Khaldūn's Introduction to History]. Cairo, 'Abd a-Wāhid Wāfī, 1957. 4 vols.

The Prolegomena of Ibn Khaldūn. Paris, E. Quatremère, 1858. 3 vols. (In Arabic.)

Shifā' as-sā'il li tahdh-ib al-masā'il [Satisfying Questions on the Correction of Problems]. Istanbul, M. Ibn Tawit at-Tanji, 1958.

At-Ta'rīf bi-Ibn Khaldūn wa rihlatuhu gharban wa sharqan [An Introduction to Ibn Khaldūn and His Travels in West and East]. Cairo, M. Ibn Tawit at-Tanji, 1951 (a.h. 1370).

Tārīkh ad-duwal al-islāmiya bi-l-Maghrib [A History of Islamic Countries in the Maghreb]. Algiers, W. M. de Slane, 1847 (a.h. 1263).

IN TRANSLATION

Les Prolégomènes d'Ebn Khaldoun [The Prolegomena of Ibn Khaldūn]. Trans. by W. M. de Slane. Paris, 1863. 3 vols. (In French.)

Ibn Khaldūn: discours sur l'histoire universelle [Ibn Khaldūn: a Presentation of Universal History]. Trans. by V. Monteil. Beirut, 1967. 3 vols. (In French.)

The Muqaddima: An Introduction to History. Trans. by F. Rosenthal. Princeton, N.J., 1958, new ed. 1967. 3 vols. (In English.)

Nations et peuples du monde [The World's Nations and Peoples]. Trans., intro. and notes by Abdesselam Cheddadi. Paris, Sindbad, 1986. 2 vols. (Extracts from the 'Ibar.) (In French.)

La voie et la loi ou le maître et le juriste [The Way and the Law or the Master and the Lawyer]. Trans., intro. and notes by René Pérez. Paris, Sindbad, 1991. (In French.)

Le voyage d'occident et d'orient : autobiographie [Travels in West and East: An Autobiography]. Trans, introd. and notes by Abdesselam Cheddadi. Paris, Sindbad, 1980. (In French.)

Works about Ibn Khaldūn, education and Islam

Ahmad, A. The Educational Thought of Ibn Khaldūn. *Journal of the Pakistan Historical Society* (Karachi), Vol. 14, 1968, pp. 175-81.

Berque, J. Ville et université: aperçu sur l'histoire de l'Ecole de Fès [Town and University: A Glimpse on the History of the Fes School]. *Revue historique de droit français et étranger* (Paris), 1948-49, pp. 64-117.

Buhs, H. The Educational System of the Muslims in the Middle Ages. *Islamic Culture* (Hyderabad), Vol. 1, 1927, pp. 442-72.

Bulliet, R. *The Patricians of Nishapur: A Study in Medieval Islamic Social History*, pp. 249-54. Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press, 1972.

Keddi, N. (ed.). *Scholars, Saints and Sufis.* Berkeley, Calif., University of California Press, 1972.

Muhasib, J. At-Tarbiya 'ind Ibn Khaldūn [Education according to Ibn Khaldūn]. *Al-Mashriq*, Vol. 43, 1949, pp. 365-98.

Qurayshi, M. A. The Educational Ideas of Ibn Khaldūn. *Journal of the Maharaja Sayajirao University* (Baroda), Vol. 14, 1965, pp. 83-92.

Sourdel, D.; Makdisi, G. (eds.). L'Enseignement en Islam et en Occident au Moyen Age [Education in the Islamic World and in the West in the Middle Ages]. *Revue des Études Islamiques* (Paris), Vol. 44, 1976. (Special issue.)

Tibawī, A. L. Philosophy of Muslim Education. *Islamic Quarterly* (Hyderabad), Vol. 4, No. 2, 1957, pp. 78-89.

CHRISTEN MIKKELSEN KOLD

(1816–70)

Jens Bjerg[1]

Around the middle of the nineteenth century, Christen Mikkelsen Kold gave the Danish free school and the Danish folk high school the form they have today. Kold's life and work must be seen against the background of N. F. S. Grundtvig's revolutionary ideas about new ways of educating people and the need for general reforms of the Danish education system at the time.[2]

Christen Kold was born at Thisted in north Jutland in 1816. At the age of 11 he was put to work as a shoemaker's apprentice in his father's shop. As he showed little or no aptitude for the trade, it was decided that he should become a teacher. Having served as a tutor on an estate, he was admitted to a teachers' training college in 1834 and graduated two years later.

Even though he wrote practically nothing about educational principles,[3] Kold's influence was enormous. So much so that he is surrounded by an almost myth-like aura today. However, in order to understand the originality of Kold's ideas, they must be placed in the broader context of Danish culture and society in the early nineteenth century.

The revivalist movement

The distinctive features of Kold's pedagogy can be traced back to his conversion and revolt against the preachings of the established Church. For 'awakened' souls like Kold, the immaculate conception of Christ, his descent into Hell and ascension to Heaven were real events. Damnation and Hell were concrete and inevitable destinies for those who did not see the light in time. Baptism and Communion were actual meetings with God. Heaven was a real place, a safe haven for the awakened. In Kold's view, such matters could not, and should not, be reduced to symbolic representations of the struggle between good and evil, as the established Church would have it. Later in life[4] Kold referred specifically to his awakening in 1834 as the source of his ideas about education:

Earlier, I thought God was a policeman, a strict schoolmaster, who watched over us and gave us a good box on the ear when we were bad. Now I realized that God loved both humanity and me, and I had this feeling that I too loved mankind – and to a lesser extent myself – and I felt joy because God loved me. I have never experienced anything like the life, the joy, the strength and power that suddenly arose in me. I was so happy about that discovery that I did not know which leg to stand on. I sought out my good friends in town and told them the wondrous news. I hardly knew what I was saying, but I managed to convey to them that God loved me and the whole of mankind despite our being sinners.[5]

The fact that his friends thought him out of his mind was to Kold further proof of the authenticity of his experience, the early Christians having been treated in the same way.

I saw how the power of the word could make hearts happy. It was the second time this realization dawned on me, the first being when my mother imbued me with that feeling. It soon became clear to me that God had given my words such power or put such words in my mouth that I could do the same. I made up my mind that very moment that this should be my business in life. I was not going to quit the teachers' training college. I would endure it, but my main task in the world would be to make hearts happy with the message that, although we were sinners, God loved us through his son, Jesus Christ.[6]

These two passages are characteristic of Kold's style. He would use examples from his own life to encourage people or to enlighten them. Usually, it is the edifying tale about how to achieve one's goals in life without failing in one's obligations to oneself and to others.

In 1825, Grundtvig had started his crusade against the established Church by maintaining that Christian dogma about the conception, death and resurrection of Christ were contrary to reason. The crucial point was a question of faith, not of reason. Christianity, in Grundtvig's view, was incompatible with the kind of enlightened reasoning and rationality preached by the established Church. Reason could never be the source of a Christian morality, just as faith could never be a derivative of biblical exegesis. The foundations of Christianity were the Apostles' Creed, faith in the Holy Trinity and the renunciation of the Devil and all his works. A true Christian, Grundtvig claimed, need only follow these simple precepts to prove his sincerity. Sophisticated and hair-splitting biblical exegesis was not only superfluous but harmful. Grundtvig's writings had an immense influence on people's view both of church and school. To some extent, the religious fundamentalists agreed with him, though they did not abandon the idea of the Scriptures as the basic source of inspiration for the church.

At the age of 19, Kold had been introduced to all these issues by teachers in his college and by revivalist preachers who travelled round the country. The following year he graduated as a teacher, but had difficulty in finding employment as he refused as a matter of principle to use the obligatory textbook on religious instruction. He gained some support for his position from Grundtvigean clergymen, but in reality he was blacklisted and debarred from teaching in public schools for the rest of his life.

Grundtvig, Kold and the Danish school about 1830

Kold set about propagating his cause. Orally and in writing he argued against the use of compulsory textbooks and rote learning in Danish schools. Education in public schools was based on the Education Act of 1814, which did away with the widespread education of children at home, stipulating that public schooling was to be compulsory – at least for the children of the populace. Up to that time parents had been free to use children to work on farms, in workshops or in trade as they saw fit, and they were equally free to give them any instruction they thought necessary. Kold sympathized with the underlying principle of this state of affairs: his idea of a school was one that, above all, complied with parental wishes. A school should teach things to children that were in accordance with their parents' Christian faith and particular way of life. So when, for brief periods of time, Kold managed to land a job as a teacher in a public school, he steadfastly refused to follow the regulations laid down by clergymen, who functioned as the official board of control. In Kold's view, children were not to be taught to read and write until they were able fully to understand what they were reading or writing about. Instead, they were to be taught biblical and general history. Neither should they be confined to a classroom: the teacher should arrange outings and excursions and use these opportunities to give children relevant information. At the same time, children should be free to tell the teacher anything that crossed their minds. For Kold, all education was centred round the act of narration: everybody has something to tell which is worth listening to. Imaginative play with reality and the telling of stories are indispensable to the activity of learning, which is why children should be allowed to remain children for as long as possible and be given a free hand to fantasize and play.

An idea which immediately suggests itself is that Kold was familiar with the thinking of Pestalozzi. Even if Kold nowhere refers directly to him, it is a fact that Gerhard Peter Brammer, the principal of the teacher-training college that Kold attended, was much influenced by Pestalozzi. In his 'Lecture on the Centenary of Heinrich Pestalozzi, 12 January 1846', Brammer said that, in all his pedagogical work, the image of Pestalozzi had constantly been present, sometimes as instruction, at other times as elevation and now and then as humiliation. It is true, Brammer continued, that the image of Pestalozzi was marked by deep shadows, but he would be remembered always for his love of children and his sympathy for the poor. For him, teachers should not be 'soulless censors', but bearers of the 'living word'. Education was a matter of oral presentation, and private schools were infinitely preferable to public schools. Incidentally, Pestalozzi was required reading in Danish teacher training colleges at the time.[7]

Such ideas stood in sharp contrast to the dominant enlightenment ideology of the Danish Church and school. The clerical view was that rote learning was the central element in the education of a child and that the measure of successful education was how much pupils had learnt by heart. Kold was an instinctive follower of Grundtvig in his crusade against the rationalist ideology of Church and

school, and from personal experience he was convinced that Grundtvig was right in stressing the importance of narration and dialogue in any educational process. The single most important element in Grundtvig's falling out with Church and school was the issue of whether faith should be grounded in the reading of books or based on personal experience. For Grundtvig, it seemed obvious that if reading became the crucial factor, lay people and the populace at large would have to submit to the clergy and the professional classes, whose judgement was at best doubtful. This anti-authoritarian attitude appealed immensely to Kold.

In a broader context, Kold's ideas, as they were articulated between 1835 and 1870, fell into a hiatus between an autocratic *ancien régime* and the beginnings of a bourgeois society that opened up vistas of social mobility and individual liberty. Kold's ideas had an immediate appeal for many farmers and peasants, who were struggling to gain economic and, above all, political influence. Though numerically impressive, they were badly organized and had little political clout. The main reason for the success of Kold's ideas is to be found in the convergence of Grundtvig's and his own ideas combined with a widespread animosity, especially in rural areas, towards the Establishment in all its forms.

The national awakening

In the spring of 1838, Kold took a job as a private tutor in North Schleswig after he had once again been denied a teaching post at a public school. Partly as a result of his own workings and partly as a result of the efforts of the Reverend Ludvig Daniel Hass (1808-81), an ardent supporter of Grundtvig, Kold became a potent symbol for the struggle between rote learning and Grundtvig's 'living word', even though Kold himself never thought of himself as a fully committed Grundtvigean.

The following year, as a direct result of the growing tension between Denmark and Germany over the border between the two countries, Kold started a series of meetings with the declared intent of setting in motion a popular and national awakening. The main fare of each meeting was the recounting of Danish historical romances for young people fashioned in such a way as to make possible an awakening in the same way as he himself as a young man had experienced a religious awakening. As far as the education of children was concerned, he was quite explicit about this mixture of secular and religious motives in so far as his aim was 'to enlighten them and imbue them with such a desire, energy and vigour as to make them believe in the love of God and the happiness of Denmark, and to make them work for this end to the best of one's modest abilities'.[8]

Kold was now convinced that children could learn anything if teaching took the form of narration instead of the reading of books. In his own work as a tutor he concentrated exclusively on oral narrative and gave up rote learning in all its forms. And, more importantly, he was now sure that his mission in life was

to work as a teacher, both for children and adults. This was his destiny, inspired partly by Grundtvig and partly by his own religious awakening.

However, he was still kept out of the public schools. Frustrated and unhappy, Kold eventually accepted an offer from Hass in the autumn of 1841 to accompany him on a missionary trip to Turkey.

Hass and his family settled in Smyrna. Kold had expected to work together with the priest, but in this he was disappointed. His job was to wait on the family, which he did until he managed to set himself up as a bookbinder. He stayed in Turkey for five years. When he decided to return to Denmark, he sailed first from Smyrna to Trieste in Italy. There he bought a push-cart for his belongings and proceeded to walk on foot the 700 miles to Denmark. During his stay in Turkey he had managed to save up money which he was determined should be used to start his own free school.

The establishment of free schools and their pedagogy

At the beginning of the nineteenth century, educational thinking was heavily influenced by the philosophy of the Enlightenment. Key figures were Rousseau, Basedow and Kant, who based a series of lectures on the education of children in 1776-77 on Basedow's *Elementarwerk*, published two years earlier. According to Basedow, children were to be treated as children, not as small adults, and school work should be a matter of bringing out the best in young inquiring minds through play and imaginative exercises. The Danish Education Act of 1814 had been inspired by such ideas. However, the established Church saw to it that a rigid framework of compulsory measures and regulations accompanied the Act, above all in the shape of rote learning and the learning of the catechism by heart. Another reason why the Act could not live up to its enlightened ideals was that the national finances were in disorder and teacher training was of mediocre quality.

To Kold, the philosophy of the Enlightenment was a disastrous step backwards. He was convinced that in the long run it would lead to the dissolution of the Danish nation state, as it ignored the past and the specific cultural norms and common efforts and dreams that made up the national identity. The conflict with Germany over Schleswig-Holstein in 1848 and again in 1864 seemed to Kold a stroke of good fortune in that it brought about a national awakening and kindled the sense of a Danish national identity.

In the 1830s, Grundtvig had consistently tried to work out plans for a new type of school, which resulted in the publication, in 1836, of *The Danish Four-leaf Clover*, and, in 1838, of his *School for Life and the Academy in Soer*. His ideas were clearly spelt out: he wanted a new type of school and university for young people of all classes to take the place of the classical Latin schools and the university, which were the domains of a privileged élite.

Kold did not see things in the accepted way. His immediate concern was the establishment of schools for the children of ordinary people, especially in rural

regions. The children of the poor would attend these schools from the age of 7 to the age of 14. Whether or not they retained their original social status afterwards was not of the slightest importance to Kold. The important thing was that, through the spoken word, these children would become enlightened and awakened in the same way as he himself had been. This was a far cry from the philosophical ideas that had inspired the Education Act of 1814 and his programme had little in common with Grundtvig's *School for Life and the Academy in Soer*. The central point for Kold was the enlightenment – in a religious/national sense – of children. The main obstacle to the achievement of that goal, as he saw it, was the emphasis on rote learning in schools, and so he started to experiment.

In the morning I started right away by telling the children a piece of biblical history, which they loved to hear. However, the problem was whether they would be able to remember it once they were called on to do so at their confirmation or at an exam. So for a fortnight I told them the story about Joseph, which to me seemed the best place to start. Then I set out to check whether the children could remember the story, and much to my surprise they were able to repeat it word for word the way they had heard it from me. Children have this strange ability that they can repeat things that they have heard word for word, and once one gets to know children, it is easy to understand why. We adults cannot do the same thing because in admitting what we hear into our hearts, we cannot but refashion it a little bit according to our own heart before we pass it on. But when children admit something into their hearts, they pass it on in the very same form in which they have heard it. I reflected on this and saw that now we had found the method to teach all Danish children and the best means to recreate Denmark such as it once was.[9]

On 1 November 1849, Kold took up a job at Ryslinge in Funen as a private tutor in the household of the Reverend Vilhelm Birkedal (1809-92), a keen supporter of Grundtvig's ideas. Most of his spare time was spent making plans for the private school he was determined to set up. Birkedal supported him actively and saw to it that he was given financial aid by people who for one reason or another were critical of public school education. Kold also applied for and obtained a state grant for his project.

On 1 November 1851, Kold's school at Ryslinge started with ten students between 15 and 20 years of age. Kold and a friend, Anders Christian Poulsen Dal (1826-99), were to teach the young men for two winter terms, that is each year from 1 November until 1 April. Kold and Poulsen Dal lived under the same conditions as their students, ate the same food and slept beside them in the loft above the classroom. Some ten years later, a Swedish visitor to Kold's folk high school at Dalum described the man and his teaching in the following terms:

People had talked to me about the eccentricity of the man, but I wasn't really sure what kind of a person I was going to meet. In front of me stood a middle-aged man with fine, clear-cut features dressed like a farmer in a homespun coat and with a little cap on his head. . . . And then he started his lecture. The students were sitting in a circle around him like intimate friends, and he began to tell them how a mysterious force that would not leave him alone had driven him to carry out his plans. His mind had warned him in vain of the debts he would incur. His spirit had insisted with equal force: You must! The funds

will be found as they are needed. And this had come to pass. . . . He related all this in a simple and straightforward manner, without the least trace of pompousness and with frequent references to things and conditions that were familiar to his audience — all in order to give them confidence and courage in their efforts to reach for higher things. Again and again there were instructive examples from the Bible. One could feel and sense his conviction that he had received a special calling, and this conviction communicated itself to his apprentices. It was just a little bit overwrought. Be that as it may, it had none of the morbid exaggeration so characteristic of the truly self-absorbed. It was more like the spark from a holy flame found in all powerful characters who have contributed to the betterment of the world. Except for the strongly felt presence of Kold's personality there is nothing in the school that makes it different from other Grundtvigean schools or folk high schools in general. There are the same relaxed teaching methods, the same lack of compulsory homework, self-instruction through the reading of first-rate authors, essay-writing and, finally, a fresh and vigorous song.[10]

Kold himself wanted his students to think of their experience in the following way:

We are a group of young farm lads, who are staying for some months at the home of Christen Mikkelsen Kold, a farmer in Hjallelse. We lend him a helping hand in his work, we have conversations inside and outside, we listen to talks, we improve our writing, arithmetic and such things, and when those months are over, we go each his own way, resume our usual tasks and are the same plain farm lads as we were before.[11]

Kold insisted that a school ought to resemble the pupils' home as much as possible in order that they might feel receptive and relaxed. The classroom, for instance, should look like an ordinary living-room. This, however, did not imply that the bringing-up of children was in any way the responsibility of the school, let alone the state. Parents alone were responsible for the upbringing of their children, and the task of the free schools was to emulate the kind of education and training that used to take place at home before the Education Act of 1814. This became part of the official programme when, in the spring of 1852, Kold and Poulsen Dal set up the first free school for children in the small village of Dalby, at the same time as their high school for young men was moved from Ryslinge to Dalum.

The last and biggest school that Kold built was a high school at Dalum near Odense, which was opened on 1 November 1862 with an intake of fifty-eight students, all of them male. The following year eighteen young women were admitted to the school. Here Kold spent his last years. In 1866 he married Ane Kirstine Jacobsen and became the father of two daughters. He died on 6 April 1870, aged 54.

From around 1850, when he set up his first school, until a few years before his death, Kold had constant financial problems. He received help from sympathizers, but it was only after he had settled at Dalum that he managed to repay all his debts as the schools became economically viable. He also had altercations with principals of other emerging high schools, whose teaching methods differed

from his 'Christian, historical and poetic' pedagogy. Kold's aim was always to enlighten, encourage and awaken while the programmes of other schools were more in accordance with Grundtvig's idea of enlightened instruction through the spoken word. Also, Kold's overwhelming personality reduced his fellow teachers to little more than stand-ins, which was one reason why the high school at Dalum closed only a few years after his death.

Kold was a man of the people who remained loyal to his social origins. His ambition in life was to create a school of and for the children and youngsters from the poorer classes. As it turned out, it attracted pupils mainly from better-off farming communities and never managed to gain any kind of foothold among the growing industrial workforce in the cities. That set the limits to Kold's achievement. At the same time, it goes some way towards explaining the endurance and success of his ideas. The fact that the free schools and, at a later stage, the folk high schools managed to establish themselves as an integral part of, and yet as an alternative to, the established education system was to a large extent due to Kold's personal efforts and zeal.[12]

Kold's educational theory[13]

All educational theory is based on a number of assumptions about human nature and the meaning of life. Many of Kold's talks are attempts at making these assumptions explicit. In his view, human beings were governed by two basic emotions: that of Christianity and that of the people or the nation. These emotions constitute the basic social make-up of any individual. Only through a simultaneous recognition of these emotions can the individual arrive at an understanding of 'the true conditions of life', as he put it. To Kold, such an understanding was a precondition for the life of the individual and the survival of the people and the nation. Individuals must have an awareness of their origins, their destiny in life and ultimate fate once their existence on earth comes to an end. Otherwise they will be unable to live a meaningful life and fulfil their destiny. The prerequisites, according to Kold, are Christianity and history. Christianity provides man with answers to such fundamental questions as the creation of the universe, the fall of man and the road to salvation and, consequently, reveals the tasks that confront the individual and the community, the people and the nation that he or she is part of. History traces the long journey of the nation and the people, demonstrates how mistakes were made, rectified, and people and communities spurred on to new efforts. The philosophy of the Enlightenment in its Danish version was to Kold's mind one of those mistakes that would lead to new insights and a change in national consciousness.

To Kold, intelligence and professional knowledge were inferior to the power of the imagination and empathy – the ability to transcend the mundane and combine elements of reality in new ways. Imagination and empathy were the driving forces behind associative and combinatory processes. As such they were clearly distinct from what he called emotion, which was the source of existential

choice and commitment to a cause. Imagination and empathy were primordial qualities; intelligence came later. The purpose of the human capacity for understanding was for man to perceive the 'true conditions of life'. The crucial point in Kold's view was that cognition of this sort could not be achieved by rational means. It was to be found in particular forms of narrative – biblical or historical – and could only be arrived at through an imaginative effort. Consequently, the source of cognition would have to be 'the spoken word' – the oral narrative, the heartfelt conversation – and not denotative or rational types of discourse. The individual seeking the truth was by definition serious and enthusiastic – or as Kold himself put it 'enlightened' – and enlightenment was a necessary precondition for a change of direction in people's lives.

So biblical history, Nordic mythology and Danish history became core subjects in Kold's schools and the mode of teaching was predominantly oral narration. Since a child has only a limited stock of experience to draw on, Kold argued, 'it is the duty of the school to place it right in the middle of events by means of the powers of the imagination so that he can get a clear notion of the race he is part of and gather the experiences necessary for the continued life of the race.'[14] This quotation is from the only educational pamphlet Kold ever wrote. Incidentally, it was not published in his lifetime, but only in 1877. In the following paragraphs we shall take a closer look at this little treatise.

In Denmark there is a current debate over the aims and purposes of primary education.[15] The present Act dates from 1975. It is based on a three-fold division of the school's aims:

1. In co-operation with the home, the school should ensure that pupils are given the opportunity to acquire knowledge, skills, working methods and forms of expression that may contribute to the individual's all-round development.
2. In all its activities, the school should seek to create such opportunities for experience and personal activity as will increase the pupil's desire to learn, to exercise the imagination and train the ability to assess, appraise and reach independent judgements.
3. The school should prepare the pupils for active participation in a democratic society and a shared responsibility for the carrying out of common tasks. Instruction and everyday life in school must be based on intellectual and spiritual liberty and democracy.

In 1850 Kold reflected on the purposes of primary education and wrote:

> It would be foolish of me to deny that a government may not have good reasons to want the population to be well informed; any father would want the same for his own children; but not knowledge which is dead. Education, says Professor Sibbern, is more than instruction [in dead knowledge] and goes on: How many people do we not see who are well read, proficient and in possession of fine skills, but in whom these things do not appear as the basis of their existence. They have not become flesh of their flesh, blood of their blood. They possess them, but they have not acquired them. And more than both instruction [in knowledge] and education, is refinement of the spirit. One wants to see one's children well-instructed; one wants more; one wants them to be educated; but ought one not

to wish for even more? Ought one not to wish to see them moving along freely and sprightly in life with open minds and brimming with certain fundamental ideas and interests, which might infuse all that has been instilled into them by instruction and all that they have acquired through education, and make it bear on fine and healthy lives so that all will not stagnate in them?[16]

Drawing on Sibbern, Kold here defines primary education as a mixture of instruction, education and refinement of the spirit. The three concepts reappear in the present Primary Education Act albeit in a different order and under other names: the first paragraph speaks about instruction, the second about the refinement of the spirit, and the third about education.

To Kold, it seemed self-evident that there must be a dialectic between the three concepts. The refinement of the spirit was the ultimate goal at the same time as it was the precondition for and most efficient means of bringing to fruition the processes of instruction and education. He was convinced that if he succeeded in awakening the spirit, instruction and education would follow of themselves. The awakening was both an end and a means in his educational thinking, and the three processes of instruction, education and refinement of the spirit would ideally grow out of the same teaching method.

Kold's reflections on children's needs and abilities led him to conclude that, as far as instruction was concerned, 'content must take priority over form, the inward over the outward. One must have something to write about before one learns to write. One must have a desire for knowledge before one learns to read, in order not to take appearance for reality, the means for the end and the symbol for the thing.'[17] Another important principle was that children should not be taught skills and given knowledge until they themselves understood the reasons why and could see 'the necessity of the information given to them, in that they can apply it immediately, be it for business or for pleasure.'[18] Skills and instruction that could not be put to immediate use he called dead knowledge, 'false and illusory opinions that have no bearing on people's thoughts, let alone their lives.'[19] Homework, examinations, the catechizing and grilling of pupils in the classroom were necessary only in connection with the checking of dead knowledge, Kold said, which was why there was no need for them in his schools.

The widespread criticism of the public schools and their teaching methods resulted in a new Primary School Act in 1855. For the free schools the most important provision was the right for parents to decide for themselves the kind of instruction that they wanted for their children. The immediate result was a growing number of pupils in the free schools and more freedom for the teachers to practise the method of oral narration. Through the spoken word (Grundtvig wrote), 'which is the natural way, formed and made available to us by the Creator, through the ear to the heart, in contrast to the artificial way of writing, children shall become aware of their own existence by hearing about their ancestors' lives'. At first they may not grasp the connection, but only find it amusing. Later they will be able to see more deeply.

To Grundtvig, 'the living word' was a unity of something sensual and ethereal. As a grateful recipient of God's love and mercy, he was more than willing to talk about sensuality. For Kold it was almost impossible because sexuality and the sensual touched on deep-seated fears in him. In Grundtvig's view, love of the world was a precondition for a cognition of the love of God. Kold, on the other hand, had to suppress it to come to terms with God. Grundtvig made a sharp distinction between the human and the divine to prevent men from striving in vain to suppress their sensuality, whereas Kold was so obsessed by his love of Jesus that his own sensuality was a lifelong source of loathing and fascination to him. Kold was familiar with the works of Søren Kierkegaard, and it is pure Kierkegaard when he talks about the fear of a punishing God as the touchstone for all human actions or the importance of the choice if freedom is not to become a burden. Born and raised in widely different circumstances, Kold and Kierkegaard had nevertheless both of them experienced a religious awakening and both of them were haunted by the fear of damnation. Grundtvig's brand of Christianity was a different thing altogether.[20]

The fundamental event in Grundtvig's life was the realization that human existence could not, and should not, be regulated according to a Christian ideal, since the essence of Christianity was the Gospel and not a set of laws to be broken or obeyed. This was the point of departure for his attacks on the established church and the education system. He wanted to challenge all pious orthodoxies, classical education, the death, as he saw it, of a living culture. In the face of this, life could not but be right, life as we experience it, in ourselves, in people and in the march of history. It was for this purpose Grundtvig wanted to use the folk high schools. He wanted ordinary people to discover the same insights and reach the same conclusions as he had. 'We need a People's Enlightenment, an enlightenment of life, to fight death in whatever form it takes: the authoritarian coercion, the snobbery for everything foreign, the contempt for all that is one's own, all spiritual domination, the hopelessness . . . .' To Grundtvig, Christianity was one thing, humanity another. God had created the world as a place for man to live in. Good works should be of use to people in this world. They were not to be understood as some kind of preparation for a life to come. It is in this light that Grundtvig's ideas about education should be understood. The school should be of use to life on this earth. It should be a school 'for life', as he himself put it, not for eternity.[21]

Kold never understood Grundtvig's approach to Christianity and, consequently, never fully agreed with his views on education. The decisive moment in Kold's life was the realization that 'God loves humanity' and that changed his life. From then on his main preoccupation was the struggle for salvation and eternal life, not just for himself but on behalf of all. This was why the notion of 'awakening' – in a religious sense – became of crucial importance in his schools. It is true that Kold and Grundtvig to some extent used the same vocabulary –'enlightenment' and 'encouragement' – to describe what they were trying to accomplish. But their ultimate goals and visions were, if not incompatible, at

least very dissimilar, something which is still noticeable in the different kinds of folk high schools found today.[22]

It was Kold who gave the free schools and folk high schools their present form. Students spend five months at a school in continuous contact with the principal and the teachers, eating at the same table, sharing the same amenities, etc. 'Kold made it all very down-to-earth, having realized that one had to be oneself and that things had to be plain in order to be true. He founded his high school on a discovery that gave him the courage to be himself: the discovery of God's love.'[23] In different circumstances and on the basis of a different philosophical stance, other educational thinkers have reached almost the same conclusions as Kold. For instance, John Dewey's ideas about education have many affinities with Kold's thinking, and even today they seem to have a genuine appeal.[24]

The folk high school today

Today there are about 200 free schools and 100 folk high schools in Denmark. They represent the heritage of Grundtvig and Kold, especially on the question of parents' right to decide the kind of instruction that they want for their children. In that respect, both Grundtvig and Kold have left their imprint on the public system of education.[25] At the same time, the teaching methods and programmes of the free schools and folk high schools have changed – some would say that they have been diluted – so that today there is a broad range of different approaches and subjects on offer.

> The high school today is many different things, perhaps as many and as different as there are high schools. They come in all shapes and forms, from the most boringly reactionary – constantly harping about genuine peasants and the good old days – to the opposite extreme, the opportunistic, trendy school whose main ambition seems to be to attract more students. And in the middle of all this there are still schools with a sober and responsible approach to problems and issues from the past and the present. There are schools where nothing seems to have changed since the time of the popular enlightenment in the nineteenth century, and schools that under the impression of the present confusion have discarded Danish poetry and Danish history and seem set on students' creativity as the only patent medicine. Classes in ceramics, drawing, embroidery – with a total disregard for quality – have taken on a religious function. But there are also schools, whose point of departure is today's living conditions and the problems that we face, which do their best to open up young people's eyes by confronting them with more genuine experiences and broader philosophies of life than can be found in the products of the endlessly triumphant entertainment industry.[26]

Be that as it may, Danish scepticism of any form of spiritual and political authority is closely connected with the ideas of Denmark and a particular Danish national identity that developed from the 1840s to the 1940s. The source of that scepticism is to be found in the ideas of Kold and Grundtvig. The latest evidence of the tenacity of that tradition came in 1992 with the Danish referendum and the refusal by the population to ratify the Maastricht Treaty of the European Community.

Notes

1. The author wishes to express his gratitude to Professor Gunhild Nissen of Roskilde University Centre for numerous useful suggestions, and to Henning Silberbrandt, lecturer at Roskilde University Centre, for the translation of this article into English.
2. A profile of N. F. S. Grundtvig also appears in this series of '100 Thinkers on Education'.
3. Except for a few brief texts, Kold only wrote one treatise, *Om Børneskolen* [On the Children's School] (1850), published posthumously in 1877.
4. In 1866 Kold gave a lecture at a two-day meeting in Copenhagen. His manuscript is lost, but the lecture was later published on the basis of a short-hand account. It is one of the most important sources for an understanding of his life and work. Grundtvig introduced Kold to the audience and said among other things: 'And so I have asked Kold, the main inspiration of the popular enlightenment in Funen, to be so good as to tell us how he originally came to embrace his fruitful career and in what light he regards the whole issue of education, both the children's school and the school for adults. And I have only one further remark to make, one that I usually never address to any speaker, which is that I hope that he won't be too brief. This man has remained silent for so long that he probably has a good deal to tell us, and I believe that we have all the time in the world to listen to him.'
5. Klaus Berntsen (ed.), *Blade til mindekransen over højskoleforstander Kristen Kold* [Leaves in the Memorial Wreath for High School Principal Kristen Kold], 2nd ed., p. 11, Odense, 1913.
6. Ibid., pp. 12-13.
7. Johannes Pedersen, *Fra friskolens og bondehøjskolens første tid* [From the First Days of the Free School and the Folk High School], p. 23, Copenhagen, 1961.
8. Berntsen, op. cit., pp. 14-15.
9. Ibid., p. 16.
10. Ibid., pp. 62-64.
11. Niels Højlund, *Folkehøjskolen i Danmark* [The Folk High School in Denmark], p. 29, Copenhagen, 1983.
12. There are at least two accounts of Kold's life and work in English: Thomas Rørdam, *The Danish Folk High Schools*, pp. 58-64, Copenhagen, 1965; and Steven M. Borisch, *The Land of the Living: The Danish Folk High Schools and Denmark's Non-Violent Path to Modernization*, pp. 186-92, Nevada City, Calif., Blue Dolphin, 1991.
13. For the following text, I am indebted to Carl Aage Larsen, *Kolds pædagogiske teori* [Kold's Educational Theory], in Johannes Hagemann et al. (eds.), *Christen Kold. 1: Pædagogik* [Christen Kold. 1: Pedagogy], pp. 49-61, Copenhagen, 1967.
14. Johannes Hagemann and Harald Sørensen (eds.), *Christen Kold. 2: Udvalgte tekster* [Christen Kold. 2: Selected Writings], p. 34, Copenhagen, 1967.
15. Jens Bjerg, 'Provincial Reflections on the Danish Educational System'. *Compare* (Abingdon, United Kingdom), Vol. 21, 1991, pp. 165-78.
16. Hagemann and Sørensen, op. cit., p. 63. F. C. Sibbern (1785-1872) was professor of philosophy at the University of Copenhagen from 1813 to 1870. He was inspired by the German Romantics' rejection of the philosophy of the Enlightenment, especially by Fichte, Schiller and Schleiermacher.
17. Ibid., p. 43.

18. Ibid., p. 51.
19. Ibid., p. 64.
20. Hanne Engberg, *Historien om Kold* [The Story of Kold], pp. 329-30, Copenhagen, 1985.
21. Kaj Thaning, *Grundtvig og Kold* [Grundtvig and Kold], in Johannes Rosendahl (ed.), *Højskolen til debat* [The Debate on the Folk High School], p. 80-82, Copenhagen, 1961.
22. Ibid., pp. 85-86.
23. Ibid., p. 92.
24. See the renewed interest in Dewey's ideas, as in Richard Rorty's lecture at the seventy-fifth annual meeting of the American Association of Colleges, 5 January 1989, 'Uddannelse, socialisation og individuation' [Education, Socialization and Individuation], *Kritik 95* (Copenhagen), 1991, pp. 88-99.
25. Bjerg, op. cit.
26. Ole Wivel, Højskolens nederlag [The Defeat of the Folk High School], in Rosendahl, op. cit., p. 151.

Works by Christen Kold

Skjærbæk Fattighus [The Poorhouse at Skjærbæk]. *Dannevirke*, No. 37, 5 February 1840.

Spørgsmål til en Sagkyndig [Questions to an Expert]. *Dannevirke*, No. 43, 26 February 1840.

Et Par Ord til Jyden i Sjælland [Some Words to the Jutlander in Sjælland]. *Dannevirke*, No. 59, 22 April 1840.

Rejsen til Smyrna [The Journey to Smyrna]. Copenhagen, 1979. (Christen Kold's Diaries, 1842-47.)

Om Børneskolen [On the Children's School]. Copenhagen, 1877. (Posthumously published treatise.)

Historien om den lille Mis [The Story of the Little Cat]. *Læsebog med Billeder for Småbørn* [Illustrated Reader for Small Children]. Copenhagen, 1865.

Tale ved 'Det kirkelige Vennemøde' 10.-11. september 1866 i København [Speech at the Annual Congregational Meeting in Copenhagen, 10-11 September 1866]. Ed. by K. Køster. Copenhagen, 1866.

Breve 1849-1870 [Letters 1849-1870]. In: R. Skovmand (ed.), *Højskolens ungdomstid i breve* [The Beginnings of the Folk High School in Letters]. Vol. 2, pp. 167-246. Copenhagen, 1960.

A number of these texts can be found in Hagemann, J.; Sørensen, H. (eds.). *Christen Kold: Udvalgte tekster* [Christen Kold: Selected Writings]. Copenhagen, 1967.

Works about Christen Kold

Berker, P. *Christen Kolds Volkhochschule. Ein Studie zur Erwachsenenbildung im Dänemark des 19. Jahrhunderts* [Christen Kold's Folk High School. A Study of Adult Education in Nineteenth-century Denmark]. Münster, 1984.

Borisch, S. M. *The Land of the Living: The Danish Folk High Schools and Denmark's Non-Violent Path to Modernization*, pp. 186-92. Nevada City, Calif., Blue Dolphin, 1991.

Goodhope, N. *Christen Kold: The Little Schoolmaster Who Helped Revive a Nation*. Blair, Neb., Lutheran Publishing House, 1956. 119 p.

Röhrig, P. Impressionen und Reflexionen aus dem Mutterland der Volkhochschule [Impressions and Reflections from the Motherland of the Folk High School]. *Neue Sammlung* (Seelze, Germany), 19th Year, 1979, pp. 457-70.

Rørdam, T. *The Danish Folk High Schools*. Copenhagen, 1965, pp. 58-64.

Simon, E. *Réveil national et culture populaire en Scandinavie* [National Awakening and Popular Culture in Scandinavia], pp. 545-62. Paris/Uppsala, 1960. (Doctoral thesis.)

Wartenweiler-Haffter, F. *Aus der Werdezeit der dänischen Volkhochshule. Das Lebensbild ihres Begründers Christen Mikkelsen Kold* [An Account of the Danish Folk High School. The Life of its Founder: Christen Mikkelsen Kold]. Erlenbach/Zurich, 1921. 2nd ed.: *Ein Sokrates in dänischen Kleidern. Christen Mikkelsen Kold und die erste Volkhochschule* [A Socrates in Danish Costume. Christen Mikkelsen Kold and the First Folk High School]. Erlenbach/Zurich, 1929.

JANUSZ KORCZAK

(1878–1942)

Tadeusz Lewowicki

Janusz Korczak (whose real name was Henryk Goldszmit) is one of the greatest and most impressive figures in contemporary pedagogy. His was a multi-faceted personality, with broad interests and extensive knowledge, a great empathy with children and a genuine concern for all social problems. A doctor by education and an educator by predilection, his passion for improving the reality he observed drove him to writing and journalism.

His life, his community activities, educational work and creative output cannot be squeezed into any standard mould, or even presented in a complete manner. For Janusz Korczak was the kind of individual who exerted a strong influence on his surroundings, changed social practice, destroyed petrified scientific dogma and laid the foundations of new theories. At the same time he was involved in wide-ranging practical activities, in the fields of medicine, education and journalism. He condemned all manifestations of evil, and derided stupidity, while himself setting an example of how the world could be made better and more beautiful. He fought for this better and more beautiful world especially for children. He set the highest value in his life on the happiness of children, and their smiling, unhampered development. In fact, he devoted his entire life to trying to bring happiness to more and more children.

His evolving personality

Janusz Korczak was born in Warsaw in 1878. His father, Józef Goldszmit, was a respected lawyer with broad scholarly interests and ambitions. The Goldszmit family had a living tradition of community activity. Janusz Korczak's grandfather, Hirsz Goldszmit, was very much involved in progressive Polish Jewish circles, belonging to 'Haskale' (which represented the Enlightenment movement in the Jewish milieu), and also practised medicine.[1] His father's brother, Jakub, was a lawyer, also involved in journalism.

This family atmosphere no doubt had an enormous influence on Janusz Korczak's development, and especially on his awareness of social problems. He was himself quite conscious of the fact that he owed a great deal to his family and immediate circle.[2] A. Lewin writes:

> His struggle against evil, injustice and ignorance was a continuation of the actions of preceding generations. There is good reason to believe that he attached great importance to genealogy. In his writings he often expressed the conviction that outstanding individuals, the 'good spirits of mankind', appear as the result of many generations of development.[3]

Janusz Korczak's personality was influenced considerably by his studies at the Praskie Gimnazjum (the school's name deriving from the name of the Praga district in Warsaw), now well known in Poland as the Wladyslaw IV Liceum. He was particularly impressed by his teacher of Greek.

Young Janusz Korczak displayed great interest in nature, and quickly developed a passion for reading, being deeply moved by the poetry of A. Mickiewicz and the novels of J. I. Kraszewski. By 1891, that is, as a 13-year-old boy, he was keeping a diary. As the years passed, various forms of writing became a strong need and an ingrained habit.

He wrote his first literary works while still at school, for example *Samòbojstwo* [Suicide] in 1895, and a series of humorous sketches in 1896. The manuscript of the 1895 work, whose main character was a man overcome by madness, was lost and never published. His first publication was the humorous *Wezel gordyjski* [Gordian Knot], which appeared in an 1896 issue of *Kolce* [Barbs]. This was also the first time the author used the cryptonym 'Hen' from the first syllable of his first name Henryk. He published more works even before going on to post-secondary studies. In 1898, as a Grade 8 pupil, he took part in the I. Paderewski literary competition. His entry was a four-act play entitled *Ktòredy?* [Which Way?]. This was the first time he used the pseudonym Janusz Korczak, by which he is known to this day.

His social programme

His sensitivity to social issues, acquired in the family home, made it impossible for Janusz Korczak not to react to all manifestations of evil, unfairness and injustice. He was aware of these phenomena both on a social and an individual level. He protested against numerous cases of coercion, whether material or spiritual. He also spoke out against poverty, unemployment, exploitation and social inequality. He did so as 'a man following a lonely path of individual decisions and deeds',4 for he did not belong officially to any political organization, but devoted all his energy to social activity, fighting for the dignity of human beings and their right to a full life, both in writing and in speech.

Janusz Korczak was closely bound to his country, occupied as it had been by invaders for so many years. Since he was deeply concerned about the fate of Poland and the Poles, he was close to those social groups that desired and actively

worked towards independence. Thus he maintained relations with progressive social groups, with a number of progressive (sometimes radical) periodical editors, with teachers, writers, journalists, doctors and students. As a social activist and practising physician, he often had contact with the poorest classes of society.

Janusz Korczak's social programme became crystallized during his medical studies, which he started in 1898 at Warsaw University's Department of Medicine. Although spread over many works and implemented in many forms, this programme was exceptionally clear and consistent. Its main aspects were improvement of living conditions, employment opportunities for all, higher sanitary standards – especially among the poorest social classes – providing children with appropriate conditions for their physical and mental development, family life as a value, education for all, equal rights for women, and many other important social issues in the Polish society of the time.

The range of Janusz Korczak's social interests and sociological observations was astonishingly broad. He had things to say on issues related to his own profession, namely medicine, but he also devoted a lot of attention to topics somewhat removed from, though not irrelevant to, medicine or education. For instance, he wrote on economics and labour relations, and did not shy away from subjects in the domains of culture, the natural sciences and ethics. He combated evil customs by criticizing and ridiculing them, but he also forced people to reflect more profoundly by appealing to their consciences, especially when his goal was to improve the living conditions of the poor, to align social practice with the principles of justice, and to win recognition for the universal right to live in dignity.

Just as his excellent sense of observation helped him to detect and condemn many unfavourable social phenomena, so his medical knowledge made it possible for him to suggest professionally grounded solutions in the area of health education. Hence, he took up the issues of health care for children, the role of an educational atmosphere in the home and the effect of such an atmosphere on child development, as well as the physical and psychological development of children and adolescents. All these were important parts of Janusz Korczak's programme of social activity, which was truly a social medicine programme, actively implemented in Korczak's medical and educational practice.

The most important aspects of his activity were those related to children. His educational efforts, which started in his early adult years, also had their genesis in social problems. The needs of poor children and the difficult circumstances of orphans became central motifs in the educational work to which Janusz Korczak devoted many years of his life. But this work and his medical practice deserve separate presentation.

His medical career

As mentioned above, Janusz Korczak began studying medicine in 1898, but did not limit himself, while a student, to a profound study of medical science. He

was involved in journalism, was active in the Warsaw Hygiene Society and wrote substantial literary works; he worked in a hospital, and also served as a teacher and educator. Among other things, he was a doctor and tutor at summer camps for children. He also travelled: in 1899 he visited Switzerland, where he was interested in health service subjects, but where he also studied diligently the educational ideas of Pestalozzi.

He obtained his medical diploma in March 1905, when he was mobilized and had to go to the front during the Russo-Japanese War. He was sent to Harbin and Tao'an Xian to work in evacuation centres, and then spent some time in Khabarovsk. He witnessed directly the horrors of war, treated others and fell ill himself. After several months he returned from the front.

While at the front in the Far East he kept up a journalistic correspondence. The awfulness of war did not keep him from writing; not only did he continue to send in articles on the war, but also wrote some on sociological or educational subjects. His journalistic output did not flag after his return to Warsaw. He published articles in medical journals, such as the professional *Krytyka Lekarska* [Medical Critique], as well as in other periodicals and in book form. Among other things, he wrote about the state of public health, problems encountered by physicians and the work of midwives.[5] He gave many lectures to medical audiences.

To further his professional knowledge, he travelled to Berlin in 1907, and to Paris in 1909, to study. At this time he also published articles on the care of newborn babies, for example: 'Waga dla niemowlat w praktyce prywatnej' [Scales for Infants in Private Practice], 'O znaczeniu karmienia piersia niemowlat' [On the Importance of Breast-feeding], 'Niedziela lekarza' [The Doctor's Sunday], 'Kropla mleka, czy niedziela lekarza?' [A Drop of Milk, or the Doctor's Sunday].[6]

Unlike his other publications, his medical writings are usually signed with his real name – Henryk Goldszmit. Most of these articles appeared in the first and second decades of the twentieth century.

During the First World War he was once again forced to practise medicine under extreme circumstances. He found himself in charge of a ward in a field hospital on the Ukrainian front, where the fate of children with war injuries made a particularly strong impression on him. In 1917 he came upon shelters for homeless children in Kiev.

Janusz Korczak's professional activity as a physician became less intensive with time. He devoted more and more time and attention to education, in both theoretical and practical terms. Although he remained a doctor in his educational work, he did not maintain a regular practice, for it seemed to him that this was not the most effective way of improving the world. While medicine can prevent and cure illnesses, it cannot turn people into better individuals. Therefore he chose to work as a teacher and educator, which would give him greater opportunities for influencing individual characters, and consequently for bettering the social environment.[7]

His educational programme

As was the case with many contemporary teachers and educators, Janusz Korczak's views were formed under the influence of turn-of-the-century educational thought. The theories of Dewey, Decroly and Montessori were receiving much attention. The so-called educational progressivism or New Education Movement was in full bloom. Schools were also being affected by the ideas of many other European and American educators. The development of educational thought in Poland was being influenced by new psychological works, and Polish education and psychology were themselves developing rapidly.

Janusz Korczak studied psychological and educational literature from his early youth. He was very interested in the history of educational thought, he was familiar with the works of Pestalozzi and Spencer, and was attracted by the contributions of Fröbel. Right from the start of his journalistic activities, he expressed respect and even fascination for the works of these authors. In 1899 he wrote in one of the periodicals of the day: 'The names of Pestalozzi, Fröbel and Spencer shine with no less brilliance than the names of the greatest inventors of the twentieth century. For they discovered more than the unknown forces of nature; they discovered the unknown half of humanity: children.'[8]

Korczak frequently read the works of Tolstoy. The ideas contained in the essay 'Who Is to Learn from Whom How to Write: Peasant Children from Us, or We from Peasant Children?' were particularly close to his own. Like Tolstoy, he proclaimed the need to rise up and open our minds to the thoughts, emotions and experiences of children.[9]

Korczak's programme of educational work was based on the thesis that children should be fully understood, that one should enter into the spirit of their world and psychology, but that, first and foremost, children must be respected and loved, treated in fact as partners and friends. In his own words: 'Children are not future people, because they are people already . . . Children are people whose souls contain the seeds of all those thoughts and emotions that we possess. As these seeds develop, their growth must be gently directed.'[10]

The view that children differ but little from adults permeates almost all of Korczak's actions. Thus he himself treated each child as one ought to behave towards a respected, thinking and feeling adult human being. He would assert that the main differences between children and adults can be observed in the emotive domain, and drew the conclusion that it is necessary to study this domain, and acquire the ability to participate in children's experiences.

On the basis of Korczak's written and practical legacy, we can outline many other key ideas of his educational programme. Some of these thoughts are still relevant today.

Apart from those mentioned above, involving a specific view of the child's social status, they also include deliberations on the need to introduce new ways of teaching in school. He criticized teaching through lectures, detachment of school curricula from life, and excessive formal relationships between teachers

and pupils. He called for the establishment of schools that children would like, offering interesting and useful subjects, and promoting a harmonious educational relationship. He stressed the need to create a holistic system of education, with co-operation between the school, the family and various social institutions.

No doubt these ideas were partly derived from the pedagogy of the New Education Movement, but they were partly the fruit of Korczak's own experimentation and meditation. The originality of his educational concepts was most clearly evident in the work he did in reform institutions, orphanages and children's summer camps.

The apparently minor and unimportant educational and protective measures, applied by Korczak in his work with children, in fact constitute a set of logically consistent and well-conceived actions. For instance, he assumed that a group of children can function well only if provided with appropriate daily living conditions. Therefore, he paid attention to children's living quarters, diet, opportunities for rest and hygiene. In this respect he was both a typical representative of contemporary pedagogy, which paid much attention to these very matters, and a physician conscious of the importance of such conditions for child development.

It was a central idea of Korczak's pedagogy that children should be provided, as far as possible, with a proper educational atmosphere in a home environment. For those children with a family home, this atmosphere should be created by the parents, whereas in the case of orphans or children with no family home for some other reason, the appropriate educational climate must be created in the orphanage or child-care institution. In such institutions, the children themselves should fulfil functions typical of family members; for instance, older children should take care of younger ones and should participate in home-making activities. For such participation to be meaningful, they must carry out specific chores. Respect for work and an understanding of the need to work are important components of the educational programme adopted by Janusz Korczak.

Self-government

The introduction of the principles of self-government had to become, in Korczak's opinion, a significant characteristic of educational work with children. Together with adults, children had to agree on the rules governing the life of the child-care institution, and then see to it that the rules were followed. Self-government of this form, which is truly authentic self-government, was introduced by Korczak in the orphanages with which he worked. The children's self-government bodies were a self-government council and a system of arbitration by fellow-inmates. The establishment of rules to be followed by both staff and inmates was an important component of self-government.[11]

In an atmosphere of joint responsibility and self-government, children cared a lot about the opinions of their comrades and staff concerning tasks carried out, progress in studies or other matters, constituting the life of the group or its indi-

vidual members. Therefore, much attention was paid to various forms of exchange of views. These included news-sheets, meetings of inmates and goodwill plebiscites. The latter was an original idea in Korczak's pedagogy, to be developed years later in sociometric methods.

It is not possible in this short review to present all, and not even the most important, aspects of Janusz Korczak's rich and extremely wide-ranging educational programme. But the above examples of his main ideas are enough to reveal Korczak's profoundly human attitude, the attitude of an educator creating his own programme with mind and heart, who hoped that 'by giving [children] maximum freedom subject to the necessary order . . . at least one ray of sunshine could be brought into their grey, gloomy lives'.[12]

Korczak's greatest success was not in fact the formulation and launching of his programme. The best reason for accepting, respecting and even admiring him is the exceptional perseverance with which he implemented this programme in practice.

His work as an educator and teacher

Korczak's first experience of education was acquired when he still worked as a physician. While a student at the Department of Medicine he accepted work in children's summer camps. In 1904 he participated in such camps for Jewish children at Michałòwka, in Ostròw Mazowiecki county. At this early stage he introduced some of his own ideas for organizing the life of a community of children. These included special duties, a system of self-control and the goodwill plebiscite.[13]

He worked once more in children's camps in the summers of 1907 and 1908. This gave him additional experience and an opportunity to test new ways of solving educational problems.[14]

In 1910 a building lot was purchased in Krochmalna Street, Warsaw, for the purpose of establishing an orphanage. This he did, introducing his educational programme into the orphanage's everyday life during the years 1912 to 1914.

He returned to his educational work as soon as he came home from the war. He collaborated with the Nasz Dom (Our Home) Educational Institute at Pruskòw near Warsaw. He resolutely overcame numerous difficulties, mainly material in nature, of the Warsaw Home for Orphans. He helped the superintendent of the home to direct the educational programme. When this institution moved to Warsaw a few years later, he continued to be involved in its management. His contact with Nasz Dom continued until 1936.

In addition to these educational activities, Korczak accepted teaching positions in various schools on a number of occasions. In 1901, while still a young man, he worked at a clandestine boarding-school for girls. This school was run by S. Sempolowska, well known in Poland as a socio-educational activist, journalist and educator.[15]

Korczak engaged in various forms of popularization of knowledge with the Warsaw Philanthropic Institution, in free reading rooms, and through the Warsaw Society for Hygiene. From 1900 he was associated with the Flying University, a clandestine post-secondary school that operated in Warsaw during the Russian partition.[16] In 1905/06 the school was legalized as the Society for Academic Courses. Later on (after 1915) the Polish Free University was founded, and Korczak became involved with it within a few years. In 1922 he gave a course at the National Institute of Special Education,[17] a school that prepared educators for work with handicapped and educationally difficult children. He gave numerous courses and lectures to scientific and lay audiences.

Korczak returned to practical educational activity in 1939. Working in an orphanage, he helped children made homeless by the war. He fought to maintain the orphanage, and was forced to move with the children to different buildings on several occasions. As a home for Jewish children, it was within the confines of the ghetto. Janusz Korczak and his children were transported to Treblinka extermination camp in 1942. He remained with them and shared their tragic end.

His journalistic and literary works

Korczak's journalistic and literary output is extremely impressive. The most recent and so far most complete bibliographies of his published works contain about 1,000 entries, including twenty-four books.[18]

His journalistic writings and various minor works are astonishing in their variety and breadth and in the multidimensionality of their subject matter. His journalistic output consists to a large degree of short columns and humorous sketches. From an early beginning in 1896, Korczak willingly wrote for *Kolce* [Barbs], a partly satirical periodical. By 1901 his initial occasional contributions had turned into a constant and regular torrent. He ran the 'Felieton Kolców' [Barbs Column], in which he wrote humorous sketches, small essays, dialogues and anecdotes. By 1904 more than 200 items had appeared in *Kolce* within the space of nine years.[19] He wrote about social behaviour and customs, and topical Warsaw issues, criticizing people's traditional mentality, and especially bourgeois morality, pretence and hypocrisy. He also criticized the traditional upbringing of children and adolescents, particularly of girls, poking fun at successive fashions, and drawing attention to the faults of schools and other shortcomings of education. He devoted much space to observations of the conditions prevailing in poor districts.

In the years 1899 to 1901 he published mainly in *Czytelnia dla Wszystkich* [Universal Reader], a weekly with avowed popularization and social-welfare goals.[20] His articles were on social subjects, and often popular-scientific in nature. In 1904 he became involved with *Glos – Tygodnik Naukowo-Literacki, Spoleczny i Polityczny* [Voice – A Scientific, Literary, Social and Political Weekly]. *Glos* represented the progressive intelligentsia, publishing authors such as the well-known writers S. Brzozowski, S. Prsybyszewski and S. Zeromski, the

educator and psychologist J. W. Dawid, and the famous socialist activist J. Marchlewski. During this period he met Z. Nalkowska, the famous writer, and L. L. Zamenhof, the creator of Esperanto.

About sixty of his articles, on social, political and educational matters, were published in *Glos* in the period 1904-05. These included vignettes of the lives of Warsaw children, polemical articles, and correspondence from the Russo-Japanese front. After 1906 he published the *Przeglad Spoleczny* [Social Review] and Spoleczenstwo [Society], which were founded when *Glos* closed down.

As he acquired more educational experience, he wrote more about educational issues, and also took up various forms of literature for children. He published poems and stories, and later the summer camp reports in novel form, Moski, *Jòzki i Srule* and *Jòzki, Jaski i Franki*. These novels are narrations of his experiences in children's camps.

With time, he wrote more and more for children. He first published minor works and then moved on to longer ones, such as *Krol Macius Pierwszy* [King Matt the First], *Krol Macius na bezludnef wyspie* [King Matt on a Desert Island], *Bankructwo małego Dzeka* [Little Jack's Bankruptcy] and *Prawidia Zycia* [Rules for Living]. These books were highly appreciated and ran to many editions.

Korczak also wrote special articles for children in the periodical *W Slòncu* [In the Sun], where he took up many complicated political and social issues. Much of his writing was for the children's periodical *Maly Przeglad* [Little Review], which he established and which was later edited jointly by children and adolescents.[21]

His educational thoughts and his own philosophy of education were set out in the books: *Jak kochac dziecko* [How to Love a Child], *Momenty wychowawcze* [Educational Instants], *Kiedy znòw bede maly* [When I Am Small Again] and *Prawo dziecka do szacunku* [The Child's Right to Respect]. He also wrote many articles for educational journals, such as *Rocznik Pedagogiczny* [Educational Annals], *Praca Szkolna* [Working in Schools] and *Glos Nauczycielski* [Teacher's Voice].

Finally, Janusz Korczak was the author of a number of literary works — novels, stories and a play. His *Senat szalencòw* [Madmen's Senate] was performed in 1931 by the Ateneum Theatre, and was received with great interest.

Korczak's activity as a writer waned in the 1930s. During this period he became very interested in Jewish and Hebrew culture, travelling to Palestine in 1934 and 1936. He published articles and stories in Palestinian periodicals, as well as in Warsaw periodicals for Jewish youth.

As an adjunct to his educational journalism, he wrote minor works on hygiene, pediatrics and social medicine. Yet another form of journalism was his very popular series of radio talks in 1935/36 and 1938/39. These talks were published in 1939 in book form, *Pedagogika zartobliwa* [Playful Pedagogy].

Written during the Second World War, his *Pamietnik* [Memoirs] occupies a special position among his writings, as a work written under tragic circumstances, in an atmosphere of growing cruelty and aggression.

Korczak's legacy

Korczak's educational works, journalism and practice attracted enormous attention even during his lifetime. He lived to see much of his writing translated into foreign languages, and the principles of Korczak's pedagogy and examples of their implementation were well known abroad.

By the opening decades of this century, Korczak's work was known and highly regarded in Russia before and after the Revolution. The Orphans' Home in Warsaw became a model institution of its kind, visited by many foreigners and familiar to Poles. The work done there exerted a considerable influence on the educational process in other orphanages of the same type. Experiences and ideas tested in the Orphans' Home were transferred to schools and extra-curricular educational institutions. This happened both before and after the Second World War.[22]

Korczak's educational ideas still arouse the interest of successive generations of teachers and educators. Many schools adopt his name as their own, and the Korczak school movement, based on implementing his educational principles, is very much alive.

The 'Old Doctor's' books are still being published. His children's books, especially the 'King Matt' series, are read by young people in many countries. His educational books are studied by adults who want to make education useful and enjoyable for children.

Research on the theory and practice of Korczak's pedagogy is being carried out in various countries. There are active Korczak research centres in Poland, Germany, Israel, France and Russia. Korczak's ideas have won recognition from the world educational community, as manifested by UNESCO's commemoration of the centenary of Korczak's birth in 1978. The task of collecting knowledge about Korczak and his work is being continued by, among others, the Janusz Korczak International Society, and the Janusz Korczak Pedagogical Legacy Group at Warsaw's Pedagogical Research Institute. As a result, his life's work is still influencing the development of educational thought and practice. But the main reason for broad acceptance of, and interest in, Korczak's life and work is the valuable content of his pedagogy as such, as well as the impressive output of his entire life, a life devoted to putting smiles on children's faces and to making adults better people. He was ever faithful to his conviction that 'our strongest bond with life is the child's open and radiant smile'.[23]

True to children and true to his ideals, ever true to himself, he laid down his own life in sharing with the children their tragic fate at Treblinka. He did not take advantage of the opportunity given him to relinquish his charges and save his own life at that price, because he really lived for his children.

Janusz Korczak exerted and continues to exert an influence on the minds and hearts of mankind, not only through his educational writing, journalism, educational and medical practice, and literary works. His influence also springs from his exceptional personality, the passion of his struggle for children's happi-

ness, and the warm sentiment he displayed for those in his care. It springs from his life itself and the sacrifice of his life under tragic circumstances.

Obstinately and with unwavering conviction, he strove to overcome the social evils affecting many people, in particular children. He managed to help children by involving adults of goodwill in the creation of better living conditions. He persevered in his work to the very end, providing an example of social and professional activity worthy of emulation. The model he left behind is perhaps his most valuable legacy. He also left future generations a challenge expressed in the words: 'It is inadmissible to leave the world as one finds it.'[24]

Notes

1. J. Merzan, 'Rodowòd Korczaka w swietle nowych dokumentòw' [Korczak's Lineage in the Light of New Documents]. *Folks-Sztyme*, No. 41, 1976.
2. J. Korczak, 'Dedykacja' [Dedication]. *Sam na sam z Bogiem, czyli modlitwy tych, ktòrzy sie nie modla* [One on One with God, or The Prayers of Those Who Do Not Pray]. Warsaw, J. Mortkowicz, Towarzystwo Wydawnicze, 1922.
3. A. Lewin (ed.), *Janusz Korczak: Pisma wybrane* [Selected Works], Vol. 1, p. 9, Warsaw, Nasza Ksiegarnia, 1978.
4. From a letter by Janusz Korczak to *Nasz Przeglad* [Our Review], No. 140, 1925.
5. 'Medycyna w samorzadzie' [Medicine in Self-government]. *Praca zbiorowa podjeta i wydana staraniem lekarzy warszawskich* [Collective Work Undertaken and Published Through the Efforts of Warsaw Physicians], Warsaw, 1906; E. Wende and Skal, 'Tajemnice pracy zawodowej akuszerek' [Professional Secrets of Midwives], *Krytyka Lekarska* [Medical Critique], 1907, No. 2.
6. These articles appeared between 1909 and 1911 in *Medycyna i Kronika Lekarska* [Medicine and the Doctor's Chronicle] and *Przeglad Pediatryczny* [Pediatric Review].
7. Lewin, op. cit., p. 8.
8. *Czytelnia dla Wszystkich* [Universal Reader], No. 52, 1899, p. 2. Profiles of Dewey, Decroly, Fröbel, Montessori, Pestalozzi, Spencer and Tolstoy appear in this series of '100 Thinkers on Education'.
9. J. Korczak, *Kiedy znow bede maly* [When I Am Small Again]. Warsaw, J. Mortkowicz, Towarzystwo Wydawnicze, 1925; Lewin, op. cit.
10. Janusz [Korczak], 'Rozwòj idei milosci blizniego w XIX wieku' [Development of the Love-thy-neighbour Ideal in the Nineteenth Century], *Czytelnia dla Wszystkich* [Universal Reader], No. 52, 1899.
11. See S. Woloszyn, *Historia wychowania i zarys mysli pedagogicznej* [History of Education and Introduction to Educational Thought], Warsaw, PWN, 1964; Lewin, op. cit.
12. See the 'Michalòwka' series in *Izraelita*, Nos. 41-42, 1904.
13. Ibid., Nos. 41-45 and 47-53.
14. He presents them in, for example, a series of vignettes of camp life, published in *Moski, Joski i Srule*, Warsaw, 1910, and in the series *Jòzki, Jaski i Franki*, published in 1911.
15. M. Falkowska, *Kalendarium tycia, dzialalnisci i twòrszosci Janusz Korczak* [Janusz Korczak: A Chronology of his Life, Work and Writings], Warsaw, Wydaw/a Szkolne i Pedagogiczne, 1978. 52 pp.

16. Ibid.
17. Ibid.
18. See A. Lewin (ed.), *Janusz Korczak, Bibliografia 1896-1942* [Collected Works, 1896–1942], Heinsberg, Agentur Dieck Verlag, 1985.
19. Ibid.
20. M. Ciesielska, 'Charakterystyka spuscizny pisarkiej Janusz Korczak' [Janusz Korczak's Legacy as a Writer], in Korczak, op. cit.
21. Ibid.
22. See Lewin, op. cit.
23. See J. Korczak, 'Smiej sie' [Burst Out Laughing], *Czytelnia dla Wszystkich* [Universal Reader], No. 2, 1900.
24. This sentence was written by Janusz Korczak in 1937, after many years of experience and strife, and still full of the will to continue his work.

Works by Janusz Korczak

Allein mit Gott. Gebete eines Menschen, der nicht betet [One with God. Prayers for Those Who Do Not Pray]. Gütersloh, Güterslohner Verlaghaus, 1981.
Colonies de vacances [Holiday Camps]. Paris, La Pensée Universelle, 1984.
Comment aimer un enfant [How to Love a Child]. Paris, Eds. Robert Lafont, 1978.
Le Droit de l'enfant en respect [The Child's Right to Respect]. Paris, Eds. Robert Lafont, 1979.
Fragmenty utworów [An Anthology of Works]. Selected by Danuta Stpniewska. Warsaw, Nasza Ksigarnia, 1978.
Ghetto Diary. New York, Holocaust Library, 1978.
La gloire [The Glory]. Paris, Flammarion, 1980.
Der kleine Prophet [The Little Prophet]. Gütersloh, Güterslohner Verlaghaus Gerd Mohn, 1988.
Moïse, le Benjamin de la Bible [Moses: The Benjamin of the Bible]. Paris, UNESCO, 1988.
Pisma wybrane [Selected Works]. Introduction and selection by Aleksander Lewin. Warsaw, Nasza Ksigarnia. Vols. 1-2, 1984; Vol. 3, 1985; Vol. 4, 1986.
Selected Works of Janusz Korczak. Warsaw, 1967.
Verteidigt die Kinder. Erzählende Pädagogik [Defend the Child: Talks on Education]. Gütersloh, Güterslohner Verlaghaus Gerd Mohn, 1978.
Wie man ein Kind lieben soll [How to Love a Child]. Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1967.
Wybór pism [Selected Texts]. Selected by Stefan Wooszyn. Warsaw, Wiedza Powszechna, 1982.

Bibliography

Beiner, F.; Dauzenroth, E.; Lax, E. *J. Korczak. Bibliographie, Quellen und Literatur 1943-1987* [J. Korczak: Bibliography, Sources and Literature, 1943–1987]. Heinsberg, Agentur Dieck Verlag, 1987.
Janusz Korczak. Bibliografia, 1896-1942 [Bibliography, 1896–1942]. Heinsberg, Agentur Dieck Verlag, 1985.
Janusz Korczak. Bibliografia polska, 1943-1987 [Polish Bibliography, 1943–87]. Heinsberg, Agentur Dieck Verlag, 1988.

NADEZHDA KONSTANTINOVNA KRUPSKAYA[1]

(1869–1939)

Mihail S. Skatkin and Georgij S. Tsov'janov

N. K. Krupskaya, the stateswoman and party activist, wife and companion of Lenin, stands at the source of Marxist-Leninist educational science. Her pedagogical legacy embraces practically all aspects of educational policy, from basic principles for the organization and management of schools, the content of education and teacher training, to adult education, the eradication of illiteracy, and children's and youth movements.

Krupskaya is renowned in many countries the world over as a theoretician and historian of educational science and as one of the main organizers of the socialist system of education. UNESCO's international Nadezhda K. Krupskaya Prize and diploma were tokens of the high esteem in which her work is held; they were awarded annually to countries, institutions, organizations and individuals for outstanding achievements in the eradication of illiteracy.

A life history

Krupskaya was born in St Petersburg on 14 February 1869. Her parents were descended from poor landowners and shared the views of the revolutionary democratic intelligentsia of the day, a fact which naturally helped to shape a progressive world view in this lively and inquisitive girl. 'Already in those days', N. K. Krupskaya subsequently wrote, 'I heard a great deal of revolutionary discussion, and my sympathies were of course with the revolutionaries' (Vol. 1, p. 9).[2] From her early youth, Krupskaya was interested in the teaching profession. She completed her secondary education in 1886 with flying colours and began her year of teacher training. On completion of her studies, however, she could find no primary teaching post in either town or country. Compelled to tutor and give private lessons in the upper forms of a boarding school, the young teacher evinced great teaching ability, formidable learning and a conscientious attitude to her work. In 1891 she became a teacher at the workers' Sunday evening school in St Petersburg.

Krupskaya concentrated her attention on the social contrasts and upheavals of life and began to look for the causes of the injustice that prevailed, and for ways of overcoming it. She was an enthusiastic reader of works on society by Russian and foreign authors, and she studied the works of the founders of communism, Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels. Krupskaya joined the revolutionary movement in 1890, becoming a member of a Marxist student society. She engaged in revolutionary conversation and classwork with the workers, and acquainted herself with their living and working conditions. 'My five years in the school', she recalls, 'breathed life into my Marxism and welded me to the working class' (Vol. 1, p. 37).

In 1895, Krupskaya joined the St Petersburg League of Struggle for the Emancipation of the Working Class, founded by V. I. Ulyanov (Lenin) and thereafter, for almost half a century, dedicated all her energy and learning to the work of the party, the service of the people and the revolutionary transformation of society. She took part in the preparations and meetings of party congresses and conferences, and devoted a great deal of attention to the publication and distribution of party literature.

In spite of her innumerable commitments, the constant persecution, arrests and terms of exile, the people's level of education became an integral part of her revolutionary concerns. 'The time will come', she wrote in 1910, 'when it will be possible to set up the kind of school the future generation needs. We will have to know how to set up such a school, and for that we need experience, and we need to work on it in advance in order to understand how to approach the task' (Vol. 1, p. 142). She made a thorough study of the work of outstanding past and contemporary educationists, such as Comenius, Rousseau, Pestalozzi, Ushinsky, Tolstoy and Dewey,[3] and of the system of education in Russia and abroad – in the United States, France, Germany, Switzerland, the United Kingdom and other countries. She took advantage of her enforced emigration to acquaint herself with schools, libraries, teachers and the vanguard of educational experience. This enabled her to make a critical analysis of the state of education in the world, to select the best of educational theory and practice and, on that basis, to 'establish as precisely as possible the Marxist position with regard to schooling'.

By the time of the October Revolution, Krupskaya had already produced more than forty publications. The most important of them, *Public Education and Democracy* (completed in 1915 and published in 1917), made an important contribution to the development of Marxist educational science. In Lenin's estimation, Krupskaya's monograph offered a new interpretation, from the viewpoint of the working class, of the great democratic educationists Rousseau and Pestalozzi, and was the first to acquaint Russian society with the educational ideas of Bellers and Owen, setting out in a systematic way the teaching of Marx and Engels on the link between education and productive labour. Drawing on a wealth of documentation, she showed how the substance of the idea of work education changed in various phases of history in accordance with the class and

conditions that shaped it. The concluding paragraph of the book serves to summarize her analysis of the history of work education:

> As long as the organization of schooling stays in the hands of the bourgeoisie, the vocational school will be a weapon directed against the interests of the working class. Only the working class can turn the vocational school into 'a tool for the transformation of contemporary society'.

The triumph of the Socialist Revolution opened up a wide range of educational activity to Krupskaya. She did a great deal of organizational, political and educational work; she was deputy to the People's Commissar (Minister) of Education; for many years, she was in charge of preparing teaching plans for the new system of education; and she edited the journal *Towards a New Life*. In those years, Krupskaya was chosen to be a delegate to all the party congresses; she was a member of its central direction, a deputy of the higher levels of government and, from 1937, a member of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR.

Krupskaya skilfully and effectively combined her work in government, party and education with her research and literary endeavours. In the course of her life she published upwards of 3,000 books, pamphlets, articles, reviews, etc. (a collected edition of her works has been published in eleven volumes). Much of her work has been translated into foreign languages and the languages of the peoples of the former USSR.

The quality of Krupskaya's work in many fields was acclaimed by the Soviet state. She was awarded the order of the Red Banner of Labour (1929) and the Order of Lenin (1933); in 1931 she was made an honorary member of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR and in 1936 she was awarded a doctorate in the educational sciences.

Krupskaya died on 27 February 1939. Her ashes were laid in the Kremlin wall next to the Lenin Mausoleum on Red Square.

The construction of socialist education

The October Revolution brought about an opportunity for the complete reconstruction of education. Problems of long-standing historical importance had to be solved, and the educational monopoly of the propertied classes broken; it was necessary to overcome the cultural backwardness of Russia and arrange for the greatest possible number of workers to be introduced to politics, learning and aesthetic values.

Her knowledge of educational science and her organizational skills put Krupskaya on a par with Lunacharsky and Pokrovsky as a founder of the radically new, socialist system of public education. The first step in that direction, as Krupskaya wrote in 1918, had to be 'the destruction of the old, class-ridden school system, which had become scandalously unjust, and the establishment of schools that would satisfy the requirements of the rising socialist order' (Vol. 2, p. 17). For her, the role of the new school was the formation of fully developed

people with an integral view of the world and a clear understanding of what was happening around them in nature and society; people prepared at the theoretical and practical levels for any kind of physical or intellectual work, and able to build a rational, fulfilled and happy life in society (Vol. 2, p. 11).

Such aims for education naturally called for the establishment of a single, all-embracing education system. When the Soviet authorities put all the country's educational establishments under the control of the People's Commissariat, it became possible to open the doors to the entire working masses, whatever their social status, nationality, creed or sex, and at the same time to establish genuine continuity between primary, secondary and higher education.

Of course, it was not easy to build a consistently democratic system of public education on the ruins of the old system, and the process was impeded by widespread destruction and famine, the civil war unleashed by counter-revolutionary forces, foreign intervention and mass illiteracy. The old textbooks were done away with, but new ones had not yet been written; the production of educational supplies and equipment had not been put in order; there were not enough school buildings and existing ones were not heated; a significant proportion of the teachers, of whom even earlier there had not been nearly sufficient, were sometimes encouraged by representatives of the old regime to sabotage the new system, and at first no new teachers were available to replace them. 'Yet in spite of all those difficulties', Krupskaya wrote in 1918, 'the development of public education is set its on course and will soon assume the definite organizational forms that life itself dictates' (Vol. 2, p. 38). The key to success was in total support for party and government policy from the mass of workers and peasants with their thirst for knowledge. The organization of education became a matter for the whole people: community soviets for public education were set up everywhere, and parents' committees were organized in schools.

A decisive role in the socialist reconstruction of education, however, was assigned to the teacher. The fact that not all of them were capable of understanding the essence of the revolutionary changes taking place in the country and the new tasks facing schools was not so much their fault as their loss. Krupskaya observes (Vol. 2, p. 57):

> In fact, the people's teacher is close to the people's environment, and in most cases is connected with it in a thousand ways; the divide between the teaching profession and the people was artificially created, for a specific purpose. The new situation is abolishing this divide, and forms of collaboration between teacher and population must be established that put an end to that unnatural division. . . . This rapprochement will ensure that schools flourish, and that through hard work together the cultural level of the country will rise, and that we will have a better future; it promises a renaissance of the teaching profession, whose role can now become honoured and respected.

Much was done in the USSR to encourage teachers to accept the new tasks, to stimulate them with a fresh formulation of educational problems, to improve their material situation and enhance their social status. Courses, seminars,

teaching methods groups and other associations were formed throughout the country for the retraining of older teachers; a vast network of training institutes for teachers in secondary and higher education was set up.

The struggle against illiteracy

The illiteracy of a considerable part of the adult population – a legacy of the old regime – constituted another, no less difficult, obstacle to the establishment of education for all. Krupskaya saw the eradication of illiteracy as a priority for Soviet education since 'economically and culturally we can develop no further without dispelling the darkness of illiteracy' (Vol. 9, p. 226). In 1919, the government issued a decree on the eradication of illiteracy affecting the 8-to-50 age group; 1920 saw the creation of the All-Russian Extraordinary Commission for the Eradication of Literacy, whose role was to concert the efforts of all organizations concerned with literacy education; in 1923, a voluntary organization called Down With Illiteracy! was formed. Its slogan, 'Literate, Teach the Illiterate!' brought young students, teachers and large sections of the intelligentsia to participate in its work. The result was that between 1920 and 1940 some 60 million adults were taught to read and write.

In 1925, the Soviet Government began to establish general, free, compulsory primary education, which led to a sharp reduction in mass illiteracy. There were no more illiterates among the younger generation. The network of primary schools expanded rapidly. Primary-school enrolment in 1929-30 was double that of 1914-15. In the national republics (in Central Asia, Transcaucasia, etc.), there were three to four times as many primary school pupils as before the Revolution. Peoples whose language had never had a written form were provided with an alphabet. Primers and other schoolbooks were written in the languages of the peoples of the USSR. In 1928, books were published in seventy national languages and, by 1934, the number of languages in print was 104.

Nevertheless, Krupskaya saw literacy training as only the beginning of the adult education process. She called for the elimination of semi-literacy, the continuation of learning through self-education, and the constant enrichment through life of both general and specialized knowledge. In the many articles she devoted to self-education, Krupskaya set out the content, form and methods or organization of the wide range of assistance on offer to those who were learning independently. She expressed her opinion that such work ought to enlist the services of all state enterprises and institutes, community organizations, educational establishments, the mass media, scientists and those working in the field of culture. On Krupskaya's initiative, a network of evening and in-service general secondary schools for adults was set up, where the level of instruction took account of the age and experience of students.

The scientific foundations of teaching methods and content

An important axis of Krupskaya's work after the October Revolution was her contribution to a radical alteration in the content of education, the development of new curricula and teaching methods for school, and the writing of new textbooks. 'It is now necessary to give new content to teaching, to link school as closely as possible with life, to bring it closer to the population, and to organize genuine communist education of children' (Vol. 2, pp. 596-97).

The knowledge imparted to children at school must prepare them for creative activity, work and the construction of socialist society. Krupskaya wrote: 'We must not content ourselves with teaching reading, writing and arithmetic; pupils must learn the rudiments of the sciences, without which it becomes impossible to make a conscious, active contribution to life.' She saw natural science as a fundamental discipline that afforded a materialistic understanding of natural phenomena and the ability to use the forces of nature wisely; another basic discipline was social science, which explained class relations and the ways in which society developed. Krupskaya believed that schools for the masses should provide a sufficiently high theoretical level of knowledge; and in 1918 she expressed the principal task of Soviet education as follows: 'We must take from science all that is important, substantial, vital – we must take it and immediately apply it to life, put it into circulation.'

Surrounding herself with the most talented people in education, Krupskaya in effect led the development of new content for formal education based on the achievements of science. She carefully studied the proposed curricula and reviewed new textbooks, and strove to establish closer thematic links between the two. In this connection she wrote: 'The workload should not overwhelm pupils and should leave them sufficient time for independent work, participation in the collective life of the school . . . physical work and active involvement in daily life' (Vol. 3, p. 44).

The development of cognitive activity in students is another important subject in Krupskaya's educational legacy. This should not be a formalized system but rather 'a fortifying understanding of things, of their very essence, which facilitates the comprehension of the development, interrelations and manifestations of phenomena – an integrated system' (Vol. 3, p. 544). In this way she sought to ensure that the knowledge imparted by general education would help students to form a scientific view of the world.

Krupskaya's work on teaching methods had a considerable effect on the development of methodology and its use in Soviet schools. She considered that the principal objectives of teaching methods were to induce pupils to think independently and act collectively in an organized fashion, to be aware of the effect of their actions, and to develop a high degree of initiative. The teacher should also show children how to acquire knowledge by themselves, to work with books and newspapers, to express their thoughts in speech and in writing, and to form

correct conclusions. Since the pre-revolutionary schools had not attached any significance to the development of scientific teaching methods, Krupskaya worked hard at developing a completely new approach to teaching methods and enhancing their place in the education system. She wrote that the teaching method should be organically linked with the essence of the subject being taught and with the history of that subject's development. In an article entitled 'Notes on Methods', she described the special features of teaching methods deriving from the context of such disciplines as mathematics, the natural sciences and the social sciences.

According to Krupskaya, further criteria for proper determination of teaching methods were: consideration of the child's personality, age and psychology; the organization of independent observations and practical activity; development of the ability to distinguish the particular and specific from the general and generic; teaching students to express and defend their own thoughts; fostering an inquisitive approach to the world outside school hours; inculcation of skills for work, research, etc.

Krupskaya was sure that well-devised methods for the organization of teaching would help suppress formalism and regimentation, passivity and insecurity in children. For this reason she believed that a teacher's mastery of methods was a combination of creativity and craftsmanship, and she made high demands on teacher training. She maintained that Soviet teachers should not only know their subject well, but also have a command of teaching methods and be familiar with what effective teaching was.

Polytechnic education

It was Krupskaya who proposed the idea of polytechnic education based on the ideas of Marxism-Leninism, developing its educational basis and putting it into practice in schools. She wrote that the universal implementation of the polytechnic system in education was to 'present students with the basics of modern engineering, which all its diverse branches have in common' (Vol. 10, p. 333). Modern engineering was to be studied in all its aspects, that is, 'in connection with general scientific data on the mastery of the forces of nature', and also 'with the organization of labour and the life of society'.

Study of the bases of production can take on a truly polytechnic character only when the theoretical learning of the students is closely linked with their practical participation in productive activities. 'Such a combination', Krupskaya observed, 'will help the rising generation to comprehend the economy as a whole, without which it is impossible to become a genuine builder of socialism.'

Krupskaya did not consider the polytechnic system to be a separate subject with an independent curriculum, specialized teacher and textbook. The application of the polytechnic principle was not to be confined to the school, the primitive school laboratories of those times, verbal explanations, excursions and meetings with leading workers. It was meant to be above all a component of general

education – not vocational training. Krupskaya wrote: 'Polytechnic education should be linked with mathematics, and with natural science, and with social science' (Vol. 10, p. 333).

> The difference between polytechnic and vocational schools is that the former's centre of gravity is in the comprehension of the processes of labour, in development of an ability to combine theory with practice, to understand the interdependency of certain phenomena, whereas in vocational school the centre of gravity is the acquisition of working skills by pupils (Vol. 4, p. 197).

Krupskaya notes, however, that it would be wrong to conclude that the polytechnic system is simply a matter of acquiring an aggregate of knowledge and skill, a number of crafts, or merely the study of modern engineering. The polytechnic is a whole system which studies the bases of production in their various forms, states of development and manifestations.

Making schools polytechnic allows the outlook of the younger generation to be considerably broadened, helps students to assimilate the ways in which the process of production tends to develop, and in this way enables them to become fully developed persons: pupils do not limit themselves to the acquisition of particular skills for work, but assimilate the technical, technological and organizational bases of production, adapting easily to any innovation and working creatively and with great efficiency. With such an approach, school not only helps pupils to develop harmoniously but also 'captivates them with the romance of modern engineering' (Vol. 4, p. 195).

Combining instruction with productive work

While studying the development patterns of capitalist production, Marx and Engels looked into the monstrous exploitation of child and adolescent labour.

> Notwithstanding the horror of capitalist exploitation of child labour and the destruction of the old family institutions, Marx regarded the involvement of children and adolescents (as well as women) in production as a progressive phenomenon which would contribute to the establishment of higher forms of family life and serve to develop the human character (Vol. I, p. 310).

This would, of course, involve only work that was within the capacity of children and adolescents.

In a number of speeches and articles, Krupskaya refers to Marx's observation that the combination of instruction with productive and manageable work early in life is a powerful means of restructuring modern society and fostering the harmonious development of students. Krupskaya gives these ideas specific content, shows how they can be implemented, and analyses the first attempts at doing so.

In the early days of the Soviet regime, not all schools had the wherewithal to organize productive work. Krupskaya explained that it was not necessary for

the work of children to take place within the school. In those days, children began their working life alongside adults early, especially in the countryside. That was real work and it had to be taken as the starting point and combined with instruction.

Later, when workshops had been set up in many schools, Krupskaya recommended that the work of schoolchildren should be of a productive nature, and the workshops were linked up with local industry.

Krupskaya considered that implementation of the polytechnic system, which provided a good awareness of production processes, and of working abilities and skills, was not in itself enough to solve all the problems connected with the preparation of active workers. People should love their work; also, they should have a conscious inner will to work, an understanding of the significance of their contribution to the common weal and a sense of responsibility for the work entrusted to them. If these qualities are to develop, then the scientifically organized work of children and adolescents must contain some new, unknown element. Such work is fascinating to children; it gives a creative character to their work and prepares them for the working life ahead. Krupskaya writes: 'The work must be interesting and manageable and, at the same time, it must be creative and not merely mechanical work' (Vol. 4, p. 247). The work must always be able to educate and raise the student to a higher level of development.

Another important aspect of labour education for Krupskaya was the inculcation of a sense of comradely mutual assistance and collective responsibility for the work done. To this end she advised those responsible

> to consider to what extent the work imparted the skills of collective labour: an ability to establish the principal aims, to get an overall picture of the work, to plan it and divide it up in such a way as to ensure that each was allotted the most appropriate task within his or her powers; the ability to come to the assistance of comrades in their work, a capacity for evaluation of the work of each person in the productive process and of the results and effectiveness of the work (Vol. 10, p. 507).

Krupskaya saw such organization of collective work as one of the most important means of conducting the communist education of the next generation.

Properly established polytechnic and labour education and upbringing in conjunction with the whole range of educational and extracurricular activities contribute to the accomplishment of a further important task in society. They are the basis on which students, while still in the process of general education, decide for themselves their future place in society, making a fully conscious choice of vocation in accordance with their abilities.

A comprehensive approach to educational problems

Krupskaya believed the principal purpose of formal education should be to impart to children and adolescents a scientific view of the world, communist morality and commitment to civic activity. That aim enabled her to ask and ans-

wer educational questions in a comprehensive way, not confined to interactions within teaching, but ranging much wider, with more substance and foundation. She saw great educational potential in the links between school and life, in students' participation in socially useful work, children's self-management, and a wide range of extracurricular activity. Sharing her thoughts with Maxim Gorky, Krupskaya said (Vol. 11, p. 451): 'The construction of socialism does not mean only the building of huge factories and grain mills: such things are necessary, but not in themselves sufficient for the construction of socialism. People must grow in mind and heart.'

Krupskaya considered children's self-organization and self-management to be important means of character formation. In a country where the working masses had taken power into their own hands, school 'self-management should endow students with the ability to pool resources and work together to solve the problems that arise in life' (Vol. 3, pp. 203-04).

She said that self-management in schools should aim to develop the activity of each child in study, work and socially useful tasks, in order to involve all pupils and offer them equal rights and opportunities, as well as equal obligations.

In the early years of the Soviet regime many teachers who had not yet achieved a sufficient grasp of the radical difference between the new type of school and the old imagined that children's self-management was a matter for the pupils alone. For this reason they keep their distance, leaving the children to their own devices and trusting in the pupils' inborn talent for self-management. They did not understand that 'one of the most important functions of self-management in schools must be the imparting to children of organizational skills which they do not yet have, (Vol. 3, p. 56). Krupskaya saw the teacher's basic task as that of helping children to organize themselves, suggesting to them in a comradely way how best to go about a given task, recommending how to ask the right questions and how to answer them, without under any circumstances doing all these things for them. The children themselves should discuss the questions collectively, take decisions and act upon them. In this way they developed a sense of responsibility for the task assigned to them, learned how to organize themselves, and became more self-disciplined and capable of self-appraisal.

Krupskaya carefully studied and summarized all new information arising from extra-curricular activity and worked out the educational objective of the content, form and methods of organization of children's free time. She considered the organization of children's technical creativity, and the study of nature, history, art and literature to be the main areas of extra-curricular activity. Krupskaya was directly involved in setting up groups of young naturalists and technicians, camps for excursions and tours, Pioneers' and schoolchildren's centres and homes, children's clubs, libraries and theatres, school museums, sports centres, playing fields, etc. Study groups and various types of creative association became the main channels through which children organized their own creative activities in such institutions, and were to be the origins of many

distinguished scientists, civil engineers, natural scientists, managers of major enterprises and exponents of culture. For Krupskaya, extra-curricular activity represented a most important means of broadening the polytechnic horizons of children and helping them to make a free and conscious choice of their future vocation. The name of Krupskaya is associated with the founding of the Pioneer and Komsomol organizations, and with their activities over many years. She saw the principal task of the Komsomol and the Pioneers as that of bringing children up in the spirit of communism, with a conscientious attitude to study and work.

Under socialism, the role of the family and the community in the upbringing of children was considerably enhanced. In contrast to earlier times, as Krupskaya remarked, socialism placed the parents' role closer to the community's educational activities. It was her view that the policy of encouraging parents to take an active part in the running of pre-school establishments, schools and extramural institutions, the propagation of educational information among parents, conversations and consultations with teachers and tutors on a one-to-one basis, and home visits, all would give a purposefulness to education and mutual interest to those involved in it. She emphasized that schools and families would always have to secure the participation of industrial collectives, organizations, institutions and societies. Krupskaya insisted constantly that society become more education-conscious: the educational knowledge of parents and of the population at large had to be increased.

Conclusion

Krupskaya's ideas on polytechnic and labour education, on the harmonious development of the personality and self-management in schools, on close links between school and daily life, the family and the community, on the teacher, together with her critical survey of the foundations of educational science at home and abroad, were a valuable element in the heritage of Soviet educational science.

Her name was held in high esteem in the USSR as a person who dedicated her life to the struggle for the victory of socialism and the flourishing of Soviet culture. Many schools, scientific and cultural institutions and streets bore her name.

Notes

1. This article was originally published in *Prospects*, Vol. 17, No. 2, 1987.
2. Quotations from the works of Nadezhda Konstantinovna Krupskaya are taken from *Pedagogičeskie sočinenija v 11 tomah* [Educational Works in Eleven Volumes], Moscow, APN RSFSR, 1957-63.
3. Profiles of Comenius, Dewey, Pestalozzi, Rousseau, Ushinsky and Tolstoy appear in this series of '100 Thinkers on Education'.

Works by N. K. Krupskaya

Prepared by Y. A. Alferov

Pedagogičeskie sočinenija v 11 tomah [Educational Works in Eleven Volumes]. Moscow, APN-RSFSR, 1957-63.

Pedagogičeskie sočinenija v sesti tomah [Educational Works in Six Volumes]. Moscow, 1978-80. These volumes include, among others: 'Public Education for Children and Adolescents'; 'Children's Self-Management in School'; 'Problems of Polytechnic Education' (all in Vol. 4); 'On the Pre-School Education of Children' (Vol. 5).

O politehničeskom obrazovanii, trudovom vospitanii i obučenii. Sbornik [On Polytechnic Education, Labour Education and Instruction. Collected Works]. Moscow, 1982. 223 pp.

Scritti di pedagogia [Educational Works]. Moscow, Progress, 1978. 311 pp.

On Labour-oriented Education and Instruction. (Preface by M. N. Skatkin.) Moscow, Progress, 1985. 165 pp. (Published in Spanish as: *La educación laboral y la enseñanza.* Moscow, Progress, 1986. 220 pp.)

Works about N. K. Krupskaya

Prepared by Y. A. Alferov

Bibliografičeskij ukazatel'pedagogičeskogo nasledija N. K. Krupskoj [Bibliography of the Educational Legacy of N. K. Krupskaya]. Moscow, 1988.

Gonarovoj, N. K. (ed.). *Pedagogičeskie vzgljady i dejatel'nost' N. K. Krupskoj* [Educational Views and Work of N. K. Krupskaya]. Moscow, 1969.

Klicakov, I. A. *Domokratičeskie i gumanističeskie idei v pedogogičeskom nasledii N. K. Krupskoj* [Democratic and Humanistic Ideas in the Educational Legacy of N. K. Krupskaya]. Gorlovka, 1992.

Litvinov, S. A. *N. K. Krupskaya: Zizn', dejatel'nost', pedagogičeskie idei* [N. K. Krupskaya: Life, Work and Educational Ideas]. Kiev, 1970.

N. K. Krupskaja i sovremennost' [N. K. Krupskaya and the Present]. Vladimir, 1989.

Obitsčkin, G. D., et al. *Nadezhda Krupskaja: eine Bibliographie* [Nadezhda Krupskaya: a Bibliography]. Berlin, Dietz, 1986.

Rudneva, E. I. *Pedagogičeskaja sistema N. K. Krupskoj* [The Education System of N. K. Krupskaya]. Moscow, 1968.

Teoretičeskoe nasledie N. K. Krupskoj i sovremennost' [The Theoretical Heritage of N. K. Krupskaya and the Present]. Moscow, 1989.

Velikina, V. M. *N. K. Krupskaja i sovremennaja skola* [N. K. Krupskaya and Today's School]. Moscow, 1989.

JOHN LOCKE

(1632–1704)

Richard Aldrich

John Locke was a great educator on several counts. In an immediate sense he was himself a practitioner and publicist of good education. This profile is concerned with his life in education, his theory of knowledge, his advice to parents on the upbringing of their children, and his educational priorities with specific reference to the curriculum. But Locke also made significant contributions to human understanding in such fields as theology, economics, medicine and science, and particularly political philosophy. This dual prominence places Locke, arguably the most significant educationist in English history, in a long and honourable tradition. As Nathan Tarcov observed: 'philosophers have been able to stand out in the realms of both educational theory and political theory ever since the two fields of thought first flowed from their common fountainhead, the *Republic* of Plato' (Tarcov, 1984, pp. 1-2).

Seventeenth-century England

In the seventeenth century England experienced two revolutions. In 1649, after years of civil war, the first culminated in the execution of King Charles I of the Stuart family and the establishment of a Commonwealth, replaced in 1653 by a Protectorate under Oliver Cromwell. In 1660 the monarchy was restored under Charles II and, on his death in 1685, the throne passed peaceably enough to his younger brother, James. Once again, however, the country's parliamentary traditions and Protestant Church were perceived to be in danger. Further resistance to the Stuart monarchy arose and in 1688 a second revolution occurred, though on this occasion James II fled to France, thus avoiding the fate of his father. The throne was assumed by his elder daughter Mary and her husband, Prince William of Orange.

These events must have touched the lives of many, if not all, of those who lived in England, Ireland, Scotland and Wales during the seventeenth century. They are integral to an understanding of the life and work of John Locke, who

was both a keen observer of, and at times a participant in, the political, constitutional, religious, economic and educational controversies of these momentous times. Indeed, he was closely connected with one of the great politicians of the day, Anthony Ashley Cooper, the first Earl of Shaftesbury.

In 1683 Locke thought it politic to remove himself to the Netherlands, though whether for his political or physical health is not entirely clear. In 1688 he returned to England as a supporter of the new regime and indeed was favoured by William of Orange with the offer of the post of ambassador to the Elector of Brandenburg, a post he refused. Nevertheless, other government appointments followed: as Commissioner of Appeal and member of a new Council of Trade. But the 1690s were important not mainly for Locke's involvement in politics, but because it was now possible for him to publish his major works, works which in some cases he had been preparing for many years. These included the *Letter Concerning Toleration* (1689), *An Essay Concerning Human Understanding* (1690), *Two Treatises of Government* (1690), and the book upon which his reputation as an educator mainly rests, *Some Thoughts Concerning Education*, the first edition of which appeared in 1693 (hereafter referred to as *Thoughts*).

A life in education

John Locke was born on 29 August 1632 at Wrington in the county of Somerset in the south-west of England. His father, also named John, was a lawyer and small landowner who supported Parliament against Charles I and served as a captain in the Parliamentary army during the English civil war. His mother Agnes, the daughter of a local tanner, Edmund Keene, was some ten years older than her husband, and 35 years of age when John, the first of their three sons, was born. It would appear that Locke's father was a stern man (for example an advocate of the severe whipping of unmarried mothers) who did not believe in indulging his son as a child, but in keeping him in awe of his father and at some distance. Whether Locke as a boy appreciated the benefits of this severe regime is not clear. Certainly as an adult he counselled parents to a similar course: 'For, liberty and indulgence can do no good to children: their want of judgment makes them stand in need of restraint and discipline' (*Thoughts*, s. 40). 'He that is not used to submit his will to the reason of others, when he is young, will scarcely hearken or submit to his own reason, when he is of an age to make use of it' (*Thoughts*, s. 36).

Little is known about John Locke's early education, though he doubtless grew up in a bookish household, and it was not until the age of 15, in 1647, that he was sent to Westminster School in London, then under the aegis of one of its most famous headmasters, Dr Richard Busby. Busby's reputation was based upon the length of his tenure of office (some fifty-seven years), his scholarship, his skill as a teacher and his unsparing use of the birch upon recalcitrant boys.

Westminster must have come as a considerable surprise to the young Locke. The physical contrast between the large urban school with more than 200 boys,

which stood in the very shadow of Westminster Abbey itself, and the far-reaching landscapes viewed from Belluton, the Locke home in Somerset, which stood above the little market town of Pensford, must have been considerable. Even more disconcerting, perhaps, to one who had been brought up in a strict Puritan and Parliamentarian atmosphere, would have been the discovery that Richard Busby was an avowed Royalist, who made no secret of his political sympathies. Indeed, prayers for the King were offered within the school an hour or so before his execution, which took place on 30 January 1649 at Whitehall, only a few hundred meters away.

Locke's studies at Westminster were centred upon the classical languages of Latin and Greek, and he also began to study Hebrew. He was clearly a hard-working boy and in 1650 was elected to a King's scholarship. This gave him the right to free lodgings within the school, and also access to major scholarships at both Oxford and Cambridge. This became Locke's ambition and he took extra lessons with Busby for a fee of £1 per quarter, and spent the summers not in Somerset, but at the under-master's establishment at Chiswick, near London, for the purposes of further study. In 1652 Locke's diligence was rewarded when he was elected to a £20 scholarship to Christ Church, Oxford.

Though Locke no doubt felt gratitude towards Busby and Westminster School for his formal education, and for his entrance to Oxford, other aspects of school life were probably less congenial. The excessively hard academic regime (the day began at 5.15 a.m.), the severe floggings, coupled with the licence which prevailed among the boys outside the periods of formal instruction, appears to have contributed towards Locke's considerable aversion to schools, and a strong preference for private and domestic education. Certainly in 1691 he advised Edward Clarke that if his son's lack of educational progress were a result of a lack of application, one remedy might be to send him: 'to Westminster, or some other very severe school, where if he were whipped soundly whilst you are looking out another fit tutor for him, he would perhaps be the more pliant and willing to learn at home afterwards' (quoted in Sahakian and Sahakian, 1975, p. 16).

Locke's formal, and no less rigorous, course at Oxford (the day began at 5 a.m.) would have included classics, rhetoric, logic, morals and geometry, and he took his Bachelor of Arts degree in 1656. This was followed by further study for the Master of Arts degree, taken two years later, in June 1658. Other subjects of study with which he was concerned were mathematics, astronomy, history, Hebrew, Arabic, natural philosophy, botany, chemistry and medicine.

Locke saw little point in the traditional scholastic disputations and wranglings which occupied so much of the undergraduate course. Rhetoric and logic, as taught in the Oxford of his day, earned his particular condemnation. Rather was he attracted to aspects of the new learning (including Cartesian rationalism) and from the beginning of his time at Oxford he kept a medical notebook, which began, simply enough, with family medical recipes collected by his mother. This progressed to the reading of the latest medical textbooks and to simple experi-

mentation. The catalogue of his final library shows that of more than 3,600 books, 402 were medical and 240 scientific (Axtell, 1968, p. 71). In December 1658 Locke was elected to a senior studentship at Christ Church, and thereafter was able to broaden the range of his studies. In 1660 he was appointed Lecturer in Greek, and in 1662 Lecturer in Rhetoric. In 1663 he was elected to the office of Censor of Moral Philosophy, one of the senior disciplinary roles in the college.

Locke's work as a tutor was not merely confined to an academic role. Though he himself had been 20 years old when entering the university, the majority of students in his care came at an earlier age, most commonly 16 or 17. One indeed, Charles Berkeley, was only 13. Locke supervised not only their courses of study, and supplied them with individual reading lists according to their abilities and interests, but also exercised guidance in matters of finance and morals.

Locke's concerns for students would have been all the more pointed given that in 1663 he himself must have felt rather alone in the world. By that date both his parents and his two brothers were dead and, in spite of some female attachments, Locke remained a bachelor to his dying day.

In 1667, at the age of 35, Locke left the University of Oxford to take up a post in the household of the Earl of Shaftesbury at Exeter House in London. There his duties were to act as medical adviser to the family and as tutor to Shaftesbury's son, also named Anthony Ashley Cooper, then a somewhat sickly and rather backward boy of 15 or 16. Locke not only fulfilled this task but also arranged young Anthony's marriage to Lady Dorothy Manners, and subsequently attended her during one miscarriage and at the birth of her eldest son, the third Anthony Ashley Cooper, as well as other children.

For some years Locke continued in this role of medical and educational adviser to the family, even after Shaftesbury's death in 1683. He supervised the education of the third Anthony, both through the appointment of a governess, Elizabeth Birch, who could speak both Latin and Greek, and directly himself. Subsequently, the boy attended Westminster School.

Although Locke's medical advice was valued within the Shaftesbury household and outside (in 1675 he received the degree of Bachelor of Medicine from the University of Oxford), his own health was never robust. Locke suffered from asthma, and found London air uncongenial. In the 1670s, while in France for the benefit of his own health, he acted as tutor to Caleb, the son of Sir John Banks, a friend of Shaftesbury. For some two years from 1677, Locke and the young Caleb, who was 15 when he came under Locke's care, travelled in France, with much time spent in Paris.

By the 1680s Locke had gained considerable experience and reputation as a tutor to the sons of the nobility and gentry: at university, in a household and on the grand tour. In Holland from 1683 he was frequently called upon to give advice upon education. From 1687 Locke lived in Rotterdam in the house of his friend Benjamin Furly, who at the time had five children aged between 6 years and 12 months – Benjohan, John, Joanna, Rachel and Arent. No doubt Locke

observed them closely and played some part in their upbringing. Indeed, he designed an engraved copy sheet for teaching children to write with Arent in mind.

But the *Thoughts* originated not from Locke's immediate concerns with the children of his acquaintances in Holland but from a request from an English friend and distant relative, Edward Clarke. Clarke was a landowner who lived at Chipley in Locke's home county of Somerset and who was concerned with the education of his children, particularly his eldest son, also named Edward, who was 8 years old in 1684 when Clarke wrote seeking Locke's advice.

Locke's first letter was written on 19 July 1684 and was received by the Clarkes on 3 August. The letters continued throughout 1685 and 1686, even after 1687 by which time the Clarkes had engaged a tutor for their son. After Locke's return from Holland in 1689 it appears that the Clarkes, and others to whom they had shown the manuscripts, urged Locke to publish them. After much revision, the first edition of *Some Thoughts Concerning Education* duly appeared in July 1693.

Locke's final years from 1691 were spent at Oates, a small Tudor manor house in Essex, just north of Epping Forest, some twenty miles from London. There he lived as a paying guest of Sir Francis and Lady Masham: writing further works on educational, philosophical and political subjects, publishing replies to his critics, visited by his friends, and taking much pleasure and interest in two of the Masham children, Esther and Francis. By this time he was a very famous man, described indeed by Lady Mary Calverley as 'the greatest man in the world' (quoted in Dunn, 1984, p. 4). His final years were painful, afflicted as he was by swelling of the legs and deafness, but his mind and pen remained as active as ever. He died at Oates on 28 October 1704 and was buried in the churchyard of the nearby parish church at High Laver. His epitaph (in Latin) which Locke wrote himself, in free translation begins:

> Near this place lies John Locke. If you wonder what kind of man he was, the answer is that he was one contented with his modest lot. A scholar by training, he devoted his studies wholly to the pursuit of truth. Such you may learn from his writings.

All Locke's published works, including those which had been issued anonymously, were bequeathed to the Bodleian Library, Oxford. His personal papers, however, were left to his young cousin Peter King (who subsequently became Lord Chancellor of England) and remained within the family. Some use was made of this material, for example by the seventh Lord King in *The Life and Letters of John Locke*, published in 1829, and by Richard Aaron in his *John Locke*, the first edition of which appeared in 1937. Not until 1948, however, were these papers open to general access when they were sold by King's descendant, Lord Lovelace, to the Bodleian Library. The Lovelace papers, which comprise some 4,000 items, provide substantial biographical material and the most revealing insights into the life and purposes of a rather private, indeed at times secretive, man who, through his public writings, became the leading philosopher and educational thinker in English history.

A theory of knowledge

Although the *Thoughts* was most immediately concerned with education, by far the most important of Locke's writings, and one which had great significance for education, was the *Essay Concerning Human Understanding* (hereafter referred to as the *Essay*). Indeed, Peter Laslett went so far as to claim that 'everything else which he wrote was important because he, Locke of the Human Understanding, had written it' (Laslett, 1960, pp. 37-38).

The *Essay* originated in 1671 when, as Locke records in his epistle to the reader, a group of five or six friends met to discuss a point in philosophy. Difficulties arose and Locke proposed a prior inquiry: 'to examine our own abilities, and see what objects our understanding were, or were not, fitted to deal with'. Two preliminary drafts of the work were prepared in 1671, but not until 1686 was the whole *Essay* in anything like final form. The first edition bore the date 1690, although copies were on sale in London and Oxford in December 1689 (Aaron, 1971, p. 55).

Locke's purpose was to examine the nature and extent of human knowledge and the degree of assent which should be given to any proposition. He began by rejecting the doctrine of innate ideas, associated with Plato, and also in his own day with Descartes; indeed, the first book of the *Essay* was largely devoted to accomplishing this task. Unfortunately, Locke's alternative image of the mind as a 'white paper void of all characters' (*Essay*, 2.1.2) has often been interpreted as meaning that all human beings start as equals. Locke did not believe this; on the contrary, he was conscious that the differing personalities and mental and physical capabilities of individuals were to some extent a product of nature rather than of nurture.

Locke's rejection of innate ideas even extended to moral principles. Justice and faith were not universal, nor was the idea of God. Differences in the ideas of people stemmed not from differences in their abilities to perceive or release their innate ideas, but from differences in their experiences. Even though certain ideas appear to be widely held, he argued, indeed even:

> If it were true in matter of fact that there were certain truths wherein all mankind agreed, it would not prove them innate, if there can be any other way shown how men may come to that universal agreement, in the things they do consent in, which I presume may be done (*Essay*, 1. 2. 3).

How then was knowledge acquired? How might men come to universal agreement? 'To this I answer, in one word, from experience' (*Essay*, 2. 1. 2). But experience itself, gained via the senses, was not sufficient of itself for knowledge. That also required the active agency of the mind upon such experience.

> Follow a child from its birth and observe the alterations that time makes, and you shall find, as the mind by the senses comes more and more to be furnished with ideas, it comes to be more and more awake; thinks more, the more it has matter to think upon. After some time it begins to know the objects, which being most familiar with it, have made

lasting impressions. Thus it comes, by degrees, to know the persons it daily converses with, and distinguishes them from strangers; which are instances and effects of its coming to retain and distinguish the ideas the senses convey to it (*Essay*, 2. 1. 22).

The senses at first let in particular ideas, and furnish this yet empty cabinet, and the mind by degrees growing familiar with some of them, they are lodged in the memory, and names got to them. Afterwards the mind, proceeding further, abstracts them, and by degrees learns the use of general names. In this manner the mind comes to be furnished with ideas and language, the materials about which to exercise its discursive faculty. And the use of reason becomes daily more visible, as these materials that give it employment increase (*Essay*, 1. 2. 15).

It must be admitted that Locke's derivation of all ideas ultimately from experience is not without its difficulties. Though, for Locke, experience embraced both sensation and reflection, clearly there are substantial qualitative differences between the simple sensations of infants, and the complex and abstract reflections of the mature adult mind. One way of attempting to resolve such difficulties is to recognize that Locke envisaged ideas of different types.

For example, John Yolton has suggested that ideas in Locke fall into four main categories:

Some of the ideas relate to children, to the learning process, to the early stages of the development of awareness. . . . Other ideas relate to self-knowledge, to learning about our own mental operations. . . . A third class of ideas found in Locke's derivation programme plays an explanatory role, helping to make sense of experience, linking one experience to others. . . . Still other ideas relate to scientific observation, to the science of nature, expressing Locke's endorsement of the methodology of the Royal Society (Yolton, 1985, p. 140).

In the eighteenth century the German philosopher, Immanuel Kant, would argue the extent to which 'though our knowledge begins with experience, it does not follow that it arises out of experience', when he emphasized the active agency of the mind in manipulating experience. In the twentieth century Sigmund Freud, the Austrian founder of psychoanalysis, would explore the non-rational forces of the human mind.

Locke, however, was neither a dogmatist nor a builder of systems. He acknowledged the possible existence of certain eternal verities – God, morality, the laws of nature – whose essence might be confirmed, rather than discovered by experience and reason. He also admitted the existence of some innate powers or qualities, recognizing that some children seem to be from birth innately more adept than others in certain respects. Nevertheless, in spite of these qualifications, Locke inclined towards nurture rather than nature and may be categorized as the founder of empiricism, a tradition which has predominated in English philosophical and educational thought until this day.

This empirical approach not only had importance for Locke's educational theory and practice but also was entirely consistent with the burgeoning contemporary revolution in thinking consequent upon the development of scientific

knowledge. In seventeenth-century England this was represented in the work and writings of such men as Francis Bacon, Robert Boyle (who, though born in Ireland, was educated and settled in England), Edmond Halley and Isaac Newton. One expression of this new scientific spirit of inquiry was the Royal Society, formed in London in 1660. Boyle, Halley, Newton and Locke were all Fellows of the Royal Society, a body which eschewed discussion of religion and politics and concentrated rather upon the promotion of 'Physico-Mathematicall Experimentall Learning'.

Parents and children

Locke brought to the practice of education his own considered views on such subjects as philosophy, psychology, Christianity and government. His medical knowledge contributed to a concern for the physical, as well as the mental and spiritual, well-being of children. He was not only a founder of empirical thought, with all that meant for ways of learning, but he also may be counted as a pioneer of scientific psychology. He believed in the importance of observing children, and of tailoring education to their needs and capacities. Above all, though he was aware of innate differences between individuals, he was a firm believer in the power of education. As he stated in the first paragraph of the *Thoughts*: 'Of all the men we meet with, nine parts of ten are what they are, good or evil, useful or not, by their education' (*Thoughts*, s. 1).

The opening phrase of the *Thoughts*, 'A sound mind in a sound body is a short, but full description of a happy state in this world', a quotation from Juvenal, and indeed given in Latin in the letter to the Clarke family and in manuscripts prior to the first edition, launches the book into a discussion about the health of the child. Locke's advice in this respect was generally sensible, if at times a trifle idiosyncratic. Thus his views on 'plenty of open air, exercise and sleep; plain diet, no wine or strong drink, and very little or no physick' (*Thoughts*, s. 30) would command general support today, though his advice on toughening the feet by wearing thin or leaky shoes so that gentlemen's sons might acquire the ability, if necessary, to go barefoot as the poor do, might seem to be somewhat harsh. Locke's advocacy of the benefits of cold water extended to teaching children to swim, both for the general promotion of their health and for the preservation of life (*Thoughts*, s. 8).

Food for children, according to Locke, should be plain and wholesome, with sugar, salt and spices used sparingly. Locke was generally in favour of fruit – apples, pears, strawberries, cherries, gooseberries and currants were encouraged – but he was less keen on melons, peaches, plums and grapes. Clothes should not be too tight, neither for boys nor girls – important advice in an age when swaddling was still prevalent.

Other recommendations designed to accustom children to cope with minor physical adversity were that beds should not be excessively comfortable, nor

mealtimes necessarily regular. One element of regularity, however, enjoined by Locke at some length, was the importance of regular bowel actions.

From the body Locke turned to the mind. He believed that parents should personally exercise firm and close authority over their children from an early age, with a view to relaxing this as they grew older: 'Fear and awe ought to give you the first power over their minds, and love and friendship in riper years to hold it' (*Thoughts*, s. 42). Locke criticized the over-indulgence of little children, and abhorred obstinate crying on their part, but had little use for any form of physical chastisement. Instead he recommended the careful application of 'esteem' and 'disgrace' (*Thoughts*, s. 56), enjoined parents to set a good example, and warned against the interventions of servants who 'by their flatteries . . . take off the edge and force of the parents' rebukes and so lessen their authority' (*Thoughts*, s. 68).

He advised parents and tutors to study their children and to note their dispositions and dislikes: 'for a child will learn three times as much when he is in tune, as he will with double the time and pains, when he goes awkwardly, or is dragged unwillingly to it' (*Thoughts*, s. 74). Toys should be simple and sturdy, possibly fashioned by the children themselves, rather than expensive and fragile.

Understandably, given his own experiences and roles in life, Locke urged upon the Clarkes the merits of a tutor rather than a school. For Locke, the best means of education was that 'children should from their first beginning to talk, have some discreet, sober, nay wise person about, whose care it should be to fashion them aright, and keep them from all ill, especially the infection of bad company' (*Thoughts*, s. 90), and he advised parents to 'spare no care nor cost to get such an one' (*Thoughts*, s. 92).

A good tutor, or indeed a good parent, would be able to encourage and to satisfy the proper and persistent questions of children, to guide them away from cruelty towards animals or other children, and to teach them the value of truth.

The *Thoughts* were written for a specific purpose: the education of the son of a country gentleman. Fundamental features of that education – the employment of a tutor, the close supervision by parents, the curriculum, even the details of diet – would have been available only to a very small proportion of the parents and children of seventeenth-century England. Locke was well aware of the niceties of rank and fortune, and proposed different routes for the son of a prince, a nobleman, and an 'ordinary gentleman's son'. Locke believed in a top-down approach to education, and that priority should be given to the sons of the gentry. In the dedicatory epistle to the *Thoughts*, he stated that 'if those of that rank are by their education once set right, they will quickly bring all the rest into order'.

Locke never wrote about popular education as such. Although in 1697, in his capacity as a Commissioner of Trade, he was involved with schemes for the establishment of workhouse schools which would have provided for destitute children aged 3 to 14 food, church attendance and craft training, Mason (1962, p. 14) concludes that 'these proposals represent Locke's contribution as an administrator rather than as an educationist'.

But although Locke was writing for a small minority of the population of his day, all boys and girls had parents, even though few children might go to school. Moreover, the theory of knowledge set out in the *Essay* was of universal application. In consequence, it is possible to argue that much of the advice to parents given in the *Thoughts* – good habits at an early age, paying attention to the child's real needs, the use of esteem and disgrace rather than of corporal punishment to discipline children, the importance of good parental example – was applicable to all ranks in society. Yolton and Yolton (1989, p. 18) have argued that, though the *Thoughts* are concerned with the education of a gentleman's son, the 'treatise is less about gentlemen than it is about developing a moral character. Morality was not limited to gentlemen.' This wider application was acknowledged by contemporaries, both within England and without. For example, Pierre Coste, in the preface to his first French translation of the *Thoughts*, entitled *De l'éducation des enfans*, and published in Amsterdam in 1695, stated:

> It is certain that this work was particularly designed for the education of gentlemen: but this does not prevent its serving also for the education of all sorts of children, of whatever class they are: for if you except that which the author says about exercises that a young gentleman ought to learn, nearly all the rules that he gives, are universal (Axtell, 1968, p. 52).

Priorities in education

Locke's hierarchy of values in the education of a gentleman's son was contained in four elements: virtue, wisdom, breeding and learning. Such lists were not unusual for seventeenth-century writers on education. Comenius, for example, proposed: erudition, morals, piety and physical welfare; while John Dury in *The Reformed School* (*c.* 1650) suggested: godliness, bodily health, manners and learning. Indeed, the *Thoughts* may be placed in a long tradition of books designed for the instruction of young gentlemen. These included Thomas Elyot's, *The Boke Named the Gouvernour* (1531), Roger Ascham's, *The Scholemaster* (1570), and two books entitled *The Compleat Gentleman*, the first written by Henry Peacham in 1622, and the second by Jean Gailhard in 1678.

Pierre Coste was but the first of a number of writers about Locke (twentieth-century examples include Villey and Reicyn) who have noted similarities between the educational themes of Montaigne and Locke. Mason (1965, p. 72), however, has suggested that the closest match with Locke's list of priorities may be found in the work of the French churchman, Claude Fleury, himself the tutor to various princes, whose *Traité du choix et de la méthode des études* [Treatise on the Choice and Method of Studies] was available in manuscript form in the 1670s, and in a definitive printed format in 1686. Fleury's list was: virtue and religion, civility, reasoning and the fruits of experience. Locke was no doubt aware of Fleury's work; indeed his library contained a copy, in English, of the

Traité. Such similarities, however, depended not upon simple borrowing, but upon the fact that writers such as Comenius, Dury, Fleury and Locke were attempting to reconcile the objectives of education as set down by the ancients, particularly by Aristotle, with the Christian faith. Indeed, as early as 1667 Locke produced the following list: virtue, religion, breeding, wisdom and study (Mason, 1965, p. 75).

Virtue was placed first in the education of a gentleman by Locke as 'absolutely requisite to make him valued and beloved by others, acceptable or tolerable to himself' (*Thoughts*, s. 135). Such virtue depended upon 'a true notion of God' and a love and reverence for 'this Supreme Being' (*Thoughts*, s. 136), which was to be promoted by simple acts of faith – morning and evening prayers, the learning and recitation of the Creed. It also required the development of 'a power of denying ourselves the satisfaction of our own desires, where reason does not authorize them' (*Thoughts*, s. 38).

Virtue, for Locke, was of supreme importance. As Yolton and Yolton (1989, pp. 18-19) have observed:

> *Some Thoughts* is in effect a manual on how to guide the child to virtue. Close to half of its total sections are concerned with this topic. . . . There is no other work in the seventeenth century that gives such a detailed account of moral man, and of how to develop that man into a responsible person.

Wisdom was to be of a practical kind: 'a man's managing his business ably and with foresight in this world' (*Thoughts*, s. 140). It did not mean being crafty or cunning, but rather to be open, fair and wise. Such wisdom Locke placed above the immediate reach of children, but children should be encouraged to strive towards this goal by becoming accustomed to truth and to sincerity, by submitting to reason and by reflecting upon the effects of their own actions. True wisdom involved the application of both reason and experience.

Good breeding was a subject upon which Locke had much to say. He sought to avoid a 'sheepish bashfulness' on the one hand and 'misbecoming negligence and disrespect' on the other (*Thoughts*, s. 141). Locke's maxim for avoiding such faults was simple: 'Not to think meanly of ourselves, and not to think meanly of others' (*Thoughts*, s. 141). The best way to cultivate a proper conversation and behaviour was to mix with people of genuine quality. There is a foretaste of Newman's ideal of a gentleman in Locke's advice that two qualities are necessary: the first a disposition not to offend others; the second the ability to express that disposition in an agreeable way. A well-bred person would exhibit goodwill and regard for all people and eschew the habits of roughness, contempt, censoriousness, contradiction and captiousness. Not that children should be encouraged to an excess of ceremony, the 'putting off of their hats and making legs modishly' (*Thoughts*, s. 145).

Finally Locke came to learning. He acknowledged that some might be surprised that this was to be placed last, especially by such 'a bookish man' (*Thoughts*, s. 147). Locke, of course, wanted all sons of gentlemen to acquire the

basics of learning – to read, to write, to express themselves clearly and to count. But he did question the wisdom of trying to bring every one to a knowledge of Latin and Greek, especially if such knowledge was to be instilled by fear and physical punishment.

Mason (1965, pp. 70-71) has suggested that it is possible 'to regard each of Locke's essentials of a good education as the culmination of those broad influences conveniently termed the Christian, the Humanist, Courtesy and rationalist traditions'. This is a useful analysis but the identification should not be pressed too closely. The more important point to be made about Locke's list is that he gave priority to those concerns (virtue, wisdom, breeding) which continue throughout life, rather than to that type of 'learning' which is frequently associated with the formal schooling of the young.

The curriculum

Consideration of Locke's views on priorities in learning leads naturally to an examination of his proposals on the curriculum.

Locke had an overall view of the curriculum which was coupled with teaching methods. He believed in starting with the plain and simple, and of building, as far as possible, upon children's existing knowledge, of emphasizing the interconnections and coherence of subjects.

Children should be taught to read at the earliest possible age – as soon as they can talk. But the learning should not be irksome; on the contrary, Locke believed that it would be better to lose a whole year rather than to give a child an aversion to learning at this early stage. Locke commented upon how much energy, practice and repetition children happily put into play, and therefore suggested 'dice and play-things with the letters on them, to teach children the alphabet by playing' (*Thoughts*, s. 148). From letters they should proceed to syllables and then to easy and pleasant books, such as Aesop's *Fables*, preferably in an edition which included pictures. Locke advocated the use of 'pictures of animals . . . with the printed names to them' (*Thoughts*, s. 156). In recognition of the difficulties inherent in such essential learning as The Lord's Prayer, Creeds and Ten Commandments, Locke recommended that these should be learned not from the printed word but orally and by heart. Locke warned against the use of the Bible as a reading book for children, a most common practice in his day, 'for what pleasure or encouragement can it be to a child to exercise himself in reading those parts of a book, where he understands nothing?' (*Thoughts*, s. 158).

Writing should begin with correct holding of the pen and the copying of large letters from a sheet. Writing would lead naturally to drawing, with due attention to perspective, a most useful skill for those who would engage in travel, so that buildings, machines and other interesting phenomena might be quickly sketched. Locke believed that a good drawing was more useful in conveying an idea to the mind than several pages of written description. Locke also urged the value of shorthand for the purpose of making quick notes.

As soon as children could speak English they should begin French, by the conversational method. Once children could speak and read French well, a task which Locke envisaged would take but a year or two, they should begin Latin. Latin, Locke declared, was 'absolutely necessary to a gentleman' (*Thoughts*, s. 164), and once again he advised that it should be taught by the conversational method. Locke was against plunging children into a mass of grammatical rules, observing that if English could be learned naturally then the same must be true of other languages. He was also against the common practice of writing elaborate themes and verses in Latin. If there was a difficulty in securing a tutor who could teach through conversation, then Locke recommended the use of easy and interesting books in Latin, with the literal English translation written between the lines of Latin. Latin, of course, was still essential for certain professions and for attendance at the universities, for many lectures and books were provided only in Latin. But Locke also recognized that Latin (and Greek) occupied too large a part in the curricula of his day, particularly for boys who were intended for trade or farming. These would be better employed in learning to write a good hand and to maintain accounts, skills not generally taught in seventeenth-century grammar schools. Locke was also doubtful about the value of memory training, particularly the practice of learning pages of Latin by heart to promote this faculty. If children were to learn by heart it should be the learning of maxims, rules and other knowledge which had a direct utility in itself.

Other subjects which Locke commended for a gentleman's son included geography, arithmetic, astronomy, geometry, chronology, and history, and generally in that order. Locke was particularly keen on this last: 'as nothing teaches, so nothing delights more than history' (*Thoughts*, s. 184). History would naturally lead on to a study of law and government, subjects of importance for future gentlemen who might be required to assume public office, either locally as Justices of the Peace, or at Westminster as Members of Parliament. Reasoning and eloquence, other skills necessary for public life, Locke urged, were best gained by practice and not by formal studies in rhetoric and logic.

In respect of science, which in the seventeenth century was usually referred to as natural philosophy and lacked disciplinary organization as such, Locke urged the study of the several manifestations of nature even though 'all the knowledge we have . . . cannot be brought into a science' (*Thoughts*, s. 193).

The curriculum should also include other types of accomplishment. Dancing was recommended from an early age, though learning to play a musical instrument was not encouraged as 'it wastes so much of a young man's time' (*Thoughts*, s. 197). The two military exercises of fencing and riding the 'great horse' or charger were commended, though Locke feared that fencing might lead to duelling and on that ground suggested wrestling as an alternative.

Locke also advised that every gentleman's son should learn at least one manual trade, and preferably two or three. Such a skill might be useful in itself, should the gentleman fall on hard times, but also promoted physical well-being and was a useful antidote to too much bookish study. Locke, who was himself a

keen gardener, recommended 'gardening or husbandry in general, and working in wood, as a carpenter, joiner or turner, these being fit and healthy recreations for a man of study, or business' (*Thoughts*, s. 204). Other recommended pursuits included varnishing, engraving and working in base and precious metals. Locke advised all gentlemen and their sons to learn merchants' accounts.

Though Locke put much store by recreation, he warned against such sedentary and potentially ruinous pastimes as cards and dice. On the other hand, he was a keen advocate of foreign travel, though he thought that this usually took place at the wrong age – between 16 and 21. Locke urged that children should either go abroad, with a tutor, between the ages of 7 and 14, so that they might learn foreign languages quickly and effectively, or after the age of 21 when, as young men of some maturity and experience, they might travel without supervision.

Conclusion

Four points may be made in conclusion.

The first is to note that Locke was, by any standards, an expert educationist. He was both a successful practitioner and writer to whom parents naturally turned for advice. Many of his educational maxims – praise in public, blame in private; the most efficient way of truly learning something is to have to explain it to others – are broadly recognized. Given this expertise, it is difficult to agree with M. V. C. Jeffreys who, while acknowledging Locke's common sense, wit and felicity of expression, described his views on education 'as the amateur, slightly garrulous reflections of an elderly bachelor' (Jeffreys, 1967, p. 108). Although by the time he wrote the *Thoughts* Locke was both elderly and garrulous, in educational matters he was hardly an amateur and, though a bachelor, he had a more genuine interest in children than many parents. As Yolton and Yolton (1989, p. 6) have commented: 'Locke was apparently fascinated with children and liked by them. His correspondence is filled with many references to the children of his friends.'

In consequence there are broad educational principles (as well as many maxims) in Locke's writings which are as applicable today as they ever were. Paradoxically, however – and this is our second point – one of the most crucial of those broad elements is an emphasis on individual differences. In one sense Locke, with his world of gentry and tutors, may appear to be far removed from the educational concerns of the twentieth century – the provision of mass schooling in a technologically based society. But his stress on the personal relationships in education, on the importance of the parental role, and on the need to treat children as individuals, may be seen as useful correctives to the supposed universal panacea of ever more efficient national schooling. In concluding the *Thoughts*, he emphasized again that: 'Each man's mind has some peculiarity, as well as his face, that distinguishes him from all others; and there are possibly scarce two children, who can be conducted by exactly the same method' (*Thoughts*, s. 216).

This emphasis accords well with the textual analysis of the *Thoughts* by M. G. Mason who has concluded that Locke's final additions to them probably represented the most sophisticated and developed parts of his educational theory. Mason's analysis reveals these to have been: (a) the vital importance of individual temperament; (b) the need to make education more attractive, or at least not so repressive; (c) the stress on reasoning and practice; and (d) the role of habit in the non-intellectual aspects of education (Mason, 1961, p. 290).

Third, it is clear that, in spite of the fact that *Some Thoughts Concerning Education*, as its title indicates, was never intended to be a comprehensive educational treatise, but originated rather as a collection of separate pieces of advice, the book soon became widely known. During the eighteenth century the *Thoughts* appeared in more than twenty editions in English (excluding collections of Locke's works), as well as in French (the first French edition appeared as early as 1695), Dutch, German, Italian and Swedish (Axtell, 1968, p. 17).

Finally, it is important to recognize Locke's place in the history not only of educational thought, but of thought itself. He lived in turbulent times and his major writings (including the *Essay* and the *Thoughts*) were published in the final decade of a century which had seen great strife: constitutional, religious, economic and intellectual. Locke was invariably on the radical rather than the traditional side in such struggles, but his radicalism was constructive and characterized by circumspection, humanity and common sense. In consequence, he was eminently qualified to distil and to transmit the new knowledge and values of his day to succeeding generations. As Aaron (1971, p. 302) noted: 'His writings secured for posterity the advances which had been made by the most radical and progressive elements of society in the seventeenth century. . . . Locke's works dominated the English mind in the first half of the eighteenth century and his influence was almost as great in America and France.'

References

Aaron, R. I. 1971. *John Locke*. 3rd ed. Oxford, Clarendon Press.

Axtell, J. L. (ed.). 1968. *The Educational Writings of John Locke*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Dunn, J. 1984. *Locke*. Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Jeffreys, M. V. C. 1967. *John Locke: Prophet of Common Sense*. London, Methuen.

Laslett, P. (ed.). 1960. *Two Treatises of Government*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Locke, J. 1690. *An Essay Concerning Human Understanding*. London.

——. 1693. *Some Thoughts Concerning Education*. London.

Mason, M. G. 1961. 'How John Locke wrote Some Thoughts Concerning Education, 1693'. *Paedagogica Historica* (Ghent), Vol. 1, No. 2, pp. 244-90.

——. 1962. 'John Locke's Proposals on Workhouse Schools'. *Durham Research Review*, No. 13, pp. 8-16.

——. 1965. 'The Literary Sources of John Locke's Educational Thoughts'. *Paedagogica Historica* (Ghent), Vol. V, No. 1, pp. 65-108.

Sahakian, M. L.; Sahakian, W. S. 1975. *John Locke*. Boston, Mass., Twayne.

Tarcov, N. 1984. *Locke's Education for Liberty*. Chicago, Ill., University of Chicago Press.
Yolton, J. W. 1985. *Locke: An Introduction*. Oxford, Basil Blackwell.
Yolton, J. W.; Yolton, J. S. (eds.). 1989. *Some Thoughts Concerning Education by John Locke*. Oxford, Clarendon Press.

Educational writings by John Locke

Of Study. 1677.
An Essay Concerning Human Understanding. 1690.
Some Thoughts Concerning Education. 1693.
Some Thoughts Concerning Reading and Study for a Gentleman. 1703.
Of the Conduct of the Understanding. 1706.

Works about John Locke

Aaron, R. I. *John Locke*. 3rd ed. Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1971.
Axtell, J. L. (ed.). *The Educational Writings of John Locke*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1968.
Ayers, M. *Locke* (Vol. I, *Epistemology*; Vol. II, *Ontology*). London, Routledge, 1991.
Cranston, M. *John Locke: A Biography*. London, Longmans, 1957.
Harrison, J.; Laslett, P. *The Library of John Locke*. 2nd ed. Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1971.
Nidditch, P. (ed.). *An Essay Concerning Human Understanding*. Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1975.
Pickering, S. F. *John Locke and Children's Books in Eighteenth-century England*. Knoxville, Tenn., University of Tennessee Press, 1981.
Squadrito, K. M. *John Locke*. Boston, Mass., Twayne, 1979.
Tarcov, N. *Locke's Education for Liberty*. Chicago, Ill., Chicago University Press, 1984.
Yolton, J. S.; Yolton, J. W. *John Locke: A Reference Guide*. Boston, Mass., G. K. Hall, 1985.
Yolton, J. W. *John Locke and the Way of Ideas*. Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1968.
——. (ed.). *The Locke Reader*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1977.
——. *Locke: An Introduction*. Oxford, Basil Blackwell, 1985.
Yolton, J. W.; Yolton, J. S. (eds.). *Some Thoughts Concerning Education by John Locke*. Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1989.

ANTON MAKARENKO[1]

(1888–1939)

G.N. Filonov

Situating Makarenko's work

The establishment and development of educational theory and the education system in the USSR was closely bound up with the scientific creativity and practical efforts of an outstanding group of Soviet educationists. Pride of place among the educationists who were determined to establish democratic ideas and principles in educational theory and practice belongs to Anton Makarenko (1888-1939); his name rightly figures high among the world's great educators, and his books, published in editions of millions on all the continents of the globe, have enjoyed enormous popularity. Makarenko's work has been the subject of research in many countries and efforts have been made to apply his ideas creatively in the education of children today. On the other hand, it still happens, and not infrequently, that, in specialist and popular literature alike, the 'Makarenko phenomenon' is explained in a one-sided or sometimes erroneous manner.

For some reason, certain foreign students of Makarenko's life and work consider that he was a 'self-taught genius', and portray his education system without any reference to its historical links with the progressive education of the past and present. This is to some extent due to the fact that in his published and widely known works, Makarenko himself makes comparatively few direct references to his attitude towards the world educational heritage and to his contemporary fellow-educators in the former Soviet Union and abroad. The most recent research, however, based on documentary evidence, shows that despite his extremely modest origins and the difficult circumstances of his early years (his father was a painter and decorator and he himself began work at the age of 17 as a teacher in an elementary school for the children of railway workers), Makarenko was deeply versed in the history of education. Many important principles which he established theoretically and proved in practice were the development of the ideas of Pestalozzi, Owen, Ushinsky, Dobroljubov and other distinguished past proponents of democratic education in the world.[2]

Examination of hitherto unpublished literary, promotional and educational writings by Makarenko, and of notes and documents from the educational establishments that he directed, provides further confirmation of the attention which Makarenko devoted to the works of the leading Soviet educators of his age – Krupskaya, Lunacharsky, Blonsky, Shacky and others.[3] Before the October Revolution, and especially in the Soviet period, his general philosophy and educational views were enormously influenced by the works of Marx, Engels and Lenin, and by the writings of the outstanding humanist Maxim Gorky. Attempts to portray this most eminent Soviet educator as an isolated 'peak on an empty plain' are thus quite unjustifiable.

Equally untrue are the claims by some students of Makarenko's work that his activities and ideas were for a long time isolated from the world of education and from progressive society in general. Even before the Second World War, during Makarenko's lifetime, his vitally positive and optimistic ideas influenced such educators as Korczak and Freinet, who – like Makarenko himself – have since acquired worldwide renown, while Fucik, Herriot and many of the distinguished foreigners who visited the Soviet Union during the 1930s noted the outstanding results produced by the teaching methods practised at the F. E. Dzerzinskij Commune, of which he was the director. Makarenko's experience and theoretical legacy have lost none of their relevance for the teaching of young people today.

The educator Makarenko

Makarenko's educational work at the Gorky Colony (1920-28) and at the Dzerzinskij Commune (1927-35) cannot be dissociated from the activities during the 1920s of schools and other educational establishments headed by such teachers as Shacky, Pistrak, Pogrebinsky and Soroka-Rosinsky. We must not, of course, underestimate the originality of Makarenko's work and educational ideas. As we have said, he started along his creative path in the company of other educationists who had affirmed, in theory and practice, the idea of a unified education based on work. Nevertheless, his ideas on many questions relating to the theory and methods of communist education went beyond current thinking and looked to the future of socialist education and teaching, noting the problems that would occur in their subsequent development.

Among the problems of socialist education in which Makarenko's theories exercise an important influence are the relationship between education and politics and between education and the other sciences, the logic of educational theory, the essence of education, the relationship between educational theory and practice, the role of education in the creation of lifestyles, parallel educational activity, and the integration of education with everyday life.

Makarenko's educational ideas

Makarenko's ideas concerning the relationship between education and other disciplines, whether in the humanities (philosophy, ethics, aesthetics and psychology), or in the natural sciences (biology and physiology) deserve serious attention. More particularly, his investigation of the essentials of a new, socialist pattern of moral and ethical relations led him to enunciate this very important idea, namely: make as many demands as possible on people, and at the same time show them as much respect as possible. This idea is occasionally criticized by some modern educationists for putting the principle of demanding something of people in such a prominent position in the 'demand/respect' dyad. Makarenko himself pointed out that, from a humanitarian point of view, respect for and demands on a person were not separate categories, but were related facets of an indivisible whole.

Makarenko's views on the nature of the relationship between education and psychology, biology and – more specifically – physiology are extremely important in tackling the theoretical problems of education, as is his associated criticism of the methodological ideas of paedology.

As we know, paedology laid claim to being the fundamental Marxist science of children, supposedly using the combined evidence of all the social and natural sciences about the formation of the young person. The science of education, on the other hand, was assigned the role of a purely applied, technical discipline, which, on the basis of the theoretical material of paedology, was expected to issue recommendations regarding actual teaching methods in school. In a number of his books and lectures (including *Report to the Ukrainian Educational Research Institute*, 1928; *Experience of Working Methods in a Children's Labour Colony*, 1931/32; *Teachers Shrug Their Shoulders*, 1932), Makarenko criticized the sociology- and biology-based ideas of paedologists, with their notions of the 'primacy' of environment and inheritance and their appeals for the passive following of what they termed the 'nature of the child', associating them with the theorists of 'free education'. He further criticized paedocentrism and underestimation of the educational role of the teacher and the children's collective and of the young person's own activity.

While fighting for a purpose-oriented education which would shape man and be answerable to society for the outcomes, Makarenko did not repeat the limited views of French materialists who contended that 'education is all'. In Makarenko's view, the power of education in a socialist society developed with the application by teaching specialists of advances in psychology, biology, medicine and all the human sciences, which were required to play an auxiliary role in the practical organization of the educational process and in research.

The problem of educational logic was held by Makarenko to be closely bound up with a grasp of the essence of education. Calling education 'the most dialectical science', he worked on the assumption that:

education is a process that is social in the broadest sense. . . . With all the highly complex world of ambient activity, the child enters into an infinite number of relationships, each of which constantly develops, interweaves with other relationships and is compounded by the child's own physical and moral growth. All this 'chaos' is seemingly quite unquantifiable but nevertheless gives rise at each particular instant to definite changes in the personality of the child. To direct and control this development is the task of the teacher.[4]

This understanding of the essence of the educational process also prompted Makarenko's criticism of the illogicalities of traditional educational theory as reflected in mistakes of the deductive-prediction, isolated-means and ethical-fetishism types. This gave rise to the now classical statement that:

the dialectical character of educational action is so great that no single means can be projected as positive if its action is not controlled by all the other means simultaneously applied. . . . An individual means may always be both positive and negative, the decisive point being not its direct logic but the logic and action of the entire system of harmoniously organized means.[5]

Makarenko's tenets of educational logic are becoming particularly relevant now that an integrated approach is being applied to the educational process as a whole, this approach being based on an understanding of the process of education as a complex whole made up of complementary components and fashioned into an orderly, harmoniously functioning system as a result of the purposeful endeavours of educators drawing upon knowledge of the general objective principles governing the formation of the personality.

Also of particular current interest are Makarenko's views regarding the relation of educational theory and practice in a socialist system of education: 'I consider that we are living in an age where practical workers are making remarkable amendments to the premises of the different sciences.'[6] The involvement of the working public in the practical construction of socialism through the use of advances in research was, in Makarenko's time, a mere project. Having accurately observed this trend, Makarenko reacted against attempts by paedologists to deduce particular principles about the development of the child's personality from general sociological, psychological, biological and other assumptions not put to the test of experience. 'A basis for . . . an educational law', he wrote, 'should be provided by the induction of total experience. Only total experience, verified as it progresses and in respect of its results, and only the comparison of integral complexes of experience can provide us with the material for selection and decision.'[7] At the same time, Makarenko by no means regarded the role of induction in learning the laws of education as exclusive and universal, but only something linked with deduction. In educational research, 'as in any other area', he continued, 'experience arises from deductive conclusions, which are significant well beyond the initial instant of experience and remain guiding principles throughout'.[8]

Of exceptional interest to the modern theory and practice of education are those ideas of Makarenko's that have become known in educational literature as 'ideas about the unity of a child's education and life' and 'education by parallel activity'. They could be merged in the general issue of the 'way of life and education'. It has long been a tenet of traditional educational theory worldwide that the chief educator of the individual is life itself, and this fundamentally materialistic notion served as a basis for the principle of conformity to nature in teaching and education (e.g. Comenius, Pestalozzi, Rousseau, Diesterweg). It stands to Makarenko's credit alone, however, that he actually established a system of education built upon the educationally effective organization of the entire life of the pupils. In this he was not passively following the 'nature of the child' but was aiming for the maximum development of each individual so as to produce a strong and creative personality prepared for life in every way.

Observing the increase in the educational opportunities offered by the way of life of children and young people in the USSR, Makarenko urged that there should be no waiting for life itself to yield its fruits spontaneously in the form of the people necessary to society, but that not only the instruction and work but the entire life of the younger generation should be organized within an integrated educational process. This idea found a clear practical application in the life of the educational institutions that he directed. The features of Soviet general education – as reflected in the transition to universal compulsory secondary education, implementation of the principle of combining education with labour and varied creative activity for children, the prospect of single-shift studies in all schools and the consequent possibility of meeting the public's needs regarding the organization of extended and full-day activity – made it possible to assert that the conditions existed for the application in schools of educationally effective organization involving every aspect of children's lives, which was one of the central ideas in Makarenko's legacy.

The educational collective

While stressing the importance of Makarenko's contribution to the elucidation of a number of problems concerning educational methods, it must be noted that this aspect of his work needs deeper and more comprehensive analysis. This mainly concerns his contribution to the methodological problems of the educational collective and methods of organizing the educational process.

In this connection, it should be noted that the very term 'educational collective' is directly associated with Makarenko's name. He examined such aspects of the educational collective as unity of external and internal relations, and the organizational structure of the collective, with its traditions, style and tone. In the life of the educational collective, Makarenko included all relations and types of activities that were typical of a democratic society. Of great interest were his ideas regarding the development of the educational functions of the collective

and its transformation from an object of the activities of educators into an actively operating agent organizing its own life.

These assumptions can be linked with the views expressed by Makarenko regarding the unity of the methods of educating and those of studying children. The traditional assumption in the past was that only when children had first been studied could they be educated. New social conditions and the new challenges facing education provoked substantial changes in these ideas. Where Makarenko played a pioneering role was in his idea of studying children during the process of being educated, a process involving the active transformation of their way of life and influencing their consciousness, feelings and conduct. In this case, the functions of studying the children's collective and the personality and individuality of each child become part and parcel of the actual methods of education. It would be wrong to conclude that Makarenko regarded the collective as the unique instrument of mass education; the unity of education through collective and individual action is a distinctive feature of his education system.

Some students of Makarenko's theoretical views narrow down his understanding of the essence of the educational collective by focusing only on the criterion of togetherness, that is, the direct association between pupils within the collective. Makarenko indeed attached definite importance to intracollective relations in the formation of the pupil's personality. In his early years of work in the Gorky Colony he even somewhat exaggerated the importance of togetherness for creating the ethos of the collective, and he himself made reference to this at a later stage. But Makarenko viewed intracollective association in conjunction with the collective's external links, to the wealth and variety of which he attached the utmost importance. The external links of the collective with a wider society provide, in Makarenko's view, the main source of those influences that are necessary to the full development of each individual. The root of human training should be the life of society in all its varied manifestations. Relations within the collective represent a distinctive 'mechanism' for processing information arriving from outside, a 'mechanism' that helps individuals to react selectively to the influences of the outside world and to form within themselves typical and individual personality traits. In just such an approach lies the key to Makarenko's ideas about the collective as a method 'which, being general and unique, at the same time provides an opportunity for each separate personality to develop its own specific features and maintain its individuality'.[9]

The attempt is sometimes made to interpret Makarenko's ideas about the formation of the personality in the collective as an encouragement to suppress children's freedom and to subordinate them unconditionally to the demands and will of the collective. Such an interpretation seems to be an extremely one-sided depiction of the relations that actually existed between the collective and the individual personality in Makarenko's scheme. In conflict situations, when the collective clashed with an individual who opposed the opinion of the community, who ignored the collective's obligations, who was capricious and tried to put anarchy in the place of discipline, the question of coercion did indeed arise. In

these situations as well, however, reaction to the individual was humane and based on the unity of showing respect and making demands. In normal circumstances in the usual educational process, relations between the collective and the individual were built on the unity of their interests and defence by the collective of the rights of each pupil. The older and stronger could not harm the younger and weaker. Such was the firm tradition of the collective and anyone contravening it bore the weight of communal reprobation. Therefore, the collective promoted the freedom of each individual.

Makarenko assigned a special place in the life of the educational collective to work, combined with instruction in the fundamentals of science and a broad socio-political and moral education. His basic ideas regarding work education may be summarized as follows:

1. Work becomes an effective means of communist education only when it forms an integral part of the general educational process; at the same time, it has no meaning unless all children and adolescents are involved in types of socially useful work suited to their age.
2. There must be a combination of such types of work as: compulsory participation in self-help; productive labour organized on the most modern technical basis possible; selectively performed creative technical work; and unpaid work for the common good. Only when all the above types of work are combined in the educational process do children and adolescents acquire the range of attitudes that permit a balanced development of their personality.
3. The pupils' labour collective and its constituent bodies and representatives must assume their own work activity, and play a decisive role in matters of profit distribution and wages through the use of a wide range of material and moral incentives, and in the organization of consumption.

At the same time, a critical look needs to be taken at the assertion by some specialists that Makarenko's experience provides a model for the organization of the educational process in which the costs of education are met out of profits from the pupils' productive work. Makarenko was never in favour of the school 'paying its way', and he took the view that the most important thing was that the life of the collective should be organized in an educationally sound fashion so as to allow the pupils' personalities to develop in a full and harmonious way. The economic outcomes of the pupils' activity were subordinate to that requirement. The fact that the pupils in the Gorky Colony and the Dzerzinskij Commune did four hours of productive work per day was regarded by Makarenko as a measure made necessary by the particular difficulties facing the USSR in the period following the civil war. He considered that the amount of time allotted to work should not be out of proportion to the amount of time spent on study, sport, art, games and socially useful work, while the economic benefit of the pupils' labour should lie in their familiarization with production processes, distribution and consumption patterns, but by no means in 'paying their own way'.

Nowadays, the main problem is how to provide pupils in general schools with work training and education for life, how to make an informed choice of a

career that will suit their individual inclinations and abilities and also match the needs of society. In such circumstances, this part of Makarenko's legacy has assumed an extremely important role, both as regards the practical side of schoolchildren's labour associations and, in particular, we suggest, as regards the organization of the corresponding educational research.

Integration with the community

Makarenko was one of the first Soviet educators to urge that the activities of various educational institutions – that is, the school, the family, clubs, public organizations, production collectives and the community existing at the place of residence – should be integrated. In this connection, he laid special emphasis on the leading role of the school as an educational and methods centre provided with the most highly qualified and proficient educational staff.

Some contemporary researchers are over-literal in repeating some of Makarenko's thoughts about the school as a mono-collective, universalizing his idea of associations of different age-groups of children and adolescents, and trying to copy specific organizational forms peculiar to the experience of the Gorky Colony and the Dzerzinskij Commune. It should be remembered that Makarenko himself drew attention to the need to use educational methods that related to the actual circumstances in which the educational process was being organized. The working conditions of modern general schools and other educational institutions naturally call to a great extent for a method other than that followed by Makarenko in the colony and the commune. As he noted, 'Other experience is possible and, had I had it, I would perhaps think differently.'[10]

This remark by Makarenko must be borne in mind today when we analyse his particular educational works. The contemporary reader must be taught to distinguish what in these works is of lasting significance, reflecting general principles of educational theory and method, and what bears the hallmark of Makarenko's period, being relevant only to the specific conditions which were the background to his experience.

Makarenko's writings

One particular question to be considered is what should be thought of Makarenko's literary works, and chiefly the three that have gained the widest readership: *The Road to Life*, *Learning to Live* and *A Book for Parents*. It would, of course, be wrong to draw a strict dividing line between Makarenko's literary writings and his purely educational works in the form of articles, lectures and talks. Their ideological, educational and conceptual basis is identical, as is the aim assigned to them by the author himself, namely the education of a genuinely free and happy person. In addition, there are pages in Makarenko's literary works where he rises to the heights of educational science. At the same time, if we regard the literary heritage of Makarenko as factual material describing his

working experience in the Gorky Colony and the Dzerzinskij Commune, we must remember that in *The Road to Life*, *Learning to Live* and other books the real facts are often generalized, displaced in time and sometimes interwoven with the author's imagination. His literary works therefore usually do not provide a strictly scientific and objective basis for studying the real facts of his educational practice. This does not, of course, detract from their literary value or from their importance as indicators of Makarenko's educational ideas and approach.

Self-government

One important function of educational science is to direct practical work not towards the slavish copying of specific forms of educational activity, but towards the creative application of the main ideas of eminent educators of the past, both in the circumstances actually encountered in the modern school and family and in the activities of clubs and voluntary organizations, trade unions and other educationally concerned social institutions. For instance, the experience and ideas of Makarenko have become topical in connection with the development of self-government, as has his understanding of the role of the most active members in the collective of an educational establishment. Attention must obviously be focused in this connection not on such specific forms of work as the system of reports and rosters in the commune, the activity of the Council of Commanders, and the various standing and temporary commissions, but on such fundamental principles as the involvement of all pupils without exception, including juniors, in various organizational functions in primary and general collectives, and the conferment of real responsibility on the collective and its subsidiary bodies for the decisions taken, for their implementation and for monitoring that implementation.

It may legitimately be maintained today that a more thorough and scientifically based approach is needed to Makarenko's ideas. This is because the fate enjoyed by socialist education systems and educational theory since Makarenko's day enables a more objective answer to be given to the question of the enduring ideological substance of those ideas.

While not setting out to make a detailed critical analysis of modern works on Makarenko, we should point out that the formation of Makarenko's ideas was a lengthy and complex process of creative quests and fortunate discoveries. At the same time, he had to overcome those mistakes and false starts that are inevitable in the life of anyone who does not follow the beaten track but boldly makes his own way towards the truth.

The emergence and development of Makarenko's educational system was not until recently the subject of any special historical and educational research. It would be wrong to suppose that back in the pre-revolutionary period or even in the early years following the October Revolution Makarenko had fully come into his own as an outstanding educator of our times. There had, for example, been elements of pupil self-government in his teaching experience before the

Revolution. However, in the difficult early years of work in the Gorky Colony, Makarenko sought the participation of only a few of the most active colony members, on whom he relied when organizing the collective. Such an approach inevitably led to the formation in the collective of 'active' and 'passive' elements, as is also frequently the case in modern educational practice. Only in the second half of the 1920s did Makarenko begin to develop the activities of the general assembly of colony members, which became the supreme collective organ of self-government, giving practically every colony member a hand in organizing the affairs of the collective.

Experience with the development of a real collective also led Makarenko to hit on the form of organization consisting of composite ad hoc groups of pupils set up to perform specific tasks of socially useful work. The leaders of such groups (detachments) were, as a rule, chosen from those who were not normally considered as 'active' pupils. This gradually made it possible to involve everyone in running the collective and in leadership, and at the same time it by-passed the privileges of the elective body and prevented its members from coming to think of themselves as belonging to an élite. In this way, the organization of the life of the pupil collective assumed a genuinely democratic and, at the same time, human character.

Makarenko's heritage

The interest in Makarenko's ideas may be explained by the fact that his experience and theoretical views were highly relevant to the tasks that Soviet education had set itself. This gave studies of Makarenko not just an academic but an applied and operative character. In the ten to fifteen years after Makarenko's death, many practising educators were attracted only by specific details of his educational technique, and the application in schools of his ideas was mainly confined to the imitation of individual aspects of his system. In subsequent decades, however, there was a widespread endeavour on the part of practising teachers to penetrate the substance of the theory and method of the educational collective, and the methods and procedures that have emerged from its educational experience.

The creative application of Makarenko's ideas in individual schools had taken place even earlier. For example, in School No. 12 of the city of Krasnodar, whose director for over thirty years was Brjuhovecky, an eminent teacher and educational researcher, the work of unifying, moulding and educating teachers and pupils alike was marked by the conscious application of a number of principles derived from Makarenko's system: the development of self-government; the cultivation of traditions of collective life; unity of the learning, labour, social, aesthetic and sporting activities of pupils in and out of school and in clubs near the pupils' homes. There were a number of examples of such schools, each of which found its own approach to applying Makarenko's ideas in the education

of children and adolescents. In the 1960s and 1970s, however, the use of these ideas in modern educational practice adopted new features.

The most notable factor was the widespread character of this movement. Many educational collectives in the Rostov, Voronezh and Lvov regions, the Stavropol territory and such major cities as Moscow, Leningrad and Kiev, carried out a select programme of varied work based on the study and practical application of Makarenko's ideas. In this creative educational activity there was no set pattern and no move towards unification. Many Moscow schools, for instance, devoted special attention to development of collective learning by pupils; in Stavropol schools, well-deserved recognition was bestowed on the activities of pupils' work associations; and in schools in the Voronezh and Lvov regions, hobby clubs for children and young people were extremely successful. At the same time, this selective approach to the use of Makarenko's ideas in modern education did not lead to any one-sided copying of his system, or individual components of it, and their exaggerated development. Modern education is marked on the whole by a search for variety in the content and form of the educational process, with abundant methods for controlling the process.

Another feature of Makarenko studies in the former Soviet Union was the study and application of his ideas in close conjunction with the traditional and modern heritage of domestic and world educational theory. The experience and ideas of Makarenko can only be truly understood and assimilated if account is taken of their historical roots, their origin and the fullness of their ties with school and educational science in Makarenko's time, and their influence on the subsequent development of educational theory and practice.

It is also important to note that Makarenko scholarship was, as we understand it, not so much the activity of a comparatively restricted circle of professionally concerned educators and researchers as the large-scale creative work of teachers, students and broad social groups, which include: (a) Makarenko detachments of young workers, employees, students and senior schoolchildren helping to organize the leisure time of children and adolescents at home; (b) Makarenko branches of the educational community familiarizing a mass audience of parents with his ideas for socialist education; and (c) school clubs, museums and other independent associations bearing Makarenko's name.

A prerequisite for the success of such a large-scale, creative and social educational movement was, of course, professional research work proper, involving the search for new sources, textual analysis and a thorough study of all the facts helping us to understand and explain the origin of Makarenko's education system, together with its development in changing historical circumstances. It must be remembered, however, that if it is confined to a narrow circle of specific scientific interests and does not have many links with practical life, such research work may turn into fruitless scholasticism. The unity of theory and practice was the most important principle of Makarenko's entire system.

There is a need for further creative study of Makarenko's ideas and for the preparation for publication of archive material which has not yet been fully cir-

culated and which throws light on many important problems of educational theory and practice. A start has been made on preparation of a new scholarly edition of the collected works of Makarenko, which it was intended to complete for the centenary of his birth; and basic research has been undertaken on his experience and views as an integral part of the experience of Soviet education and educational theory as a whole. Nothing of all this detracts, however, from the importance of what has already been done as regards making varied use of his experience and his literary and research works in order to improve socialist educational science.

As shown by research in the former USSR by A. A. Frolov, F. I. Naumenko and others, there is still a great deal of unpublished Makarenko material. There were many dozens of documents concerning Makarenko in the Central State Archives of Literature and Art of the USSR. Makarenko material was also to be found in the archives of Moscow, Kiev, Kharkov, Poltava and Kremenchug, and in other major libraries and museums. In conjunction with the published works of Makarenko, the vast amount written about his life and activity, and special research, this new material enables a more thorough study of his legacy to be continued.[11]

At the same time, new research by Makarenko specialists in no way reduced the significance of what was done earlier. An important contribution has been made by students to the practice and theory of Makarenko such as I. F. Kozlov, A. G. Ter-Gevondjan, E. N. Medynskij, N. A. Ljalin and V. A. Suhomlinskij. Work has been done in this respect by the staff of the laboratory of the Academy of Pedagogical Sciences, who included I. A. Kairov, G. S. Makarenko, V. E. Gmurman, M. D. Vinogradova and a number of other scholars specializing in education. Equally important was the investigation of specific problems of educational theory and method directly connected with the creative legacy of Makarenko. This concerns problems of school discipline (E. I. Monoszon, L. E. Raskin), the collective and school self-management (T. E. Konnikova, V. M. Korotov, S. A. Mal'kova, L. I. Novikova) and many others. Emphasis must finally be laid on the enormous interest and importance attached to the study of the experience and theoretical works of Makarenko abroad, in countries with differing social and political systems and their own traditions regarding the education of children and young people, and a host of differing conceptions with regard to educational theory. This growing interest is one sign of the undeniable trend towards closer contact between people and state systems in the modern world, a matter in which both science and art have a pre-eminent part to play.

Notes

1. This profile was first published in *Prospects*, Vol. 11, No. 3, 1981, under the title 'The Educator Makarenko'.
2. Profiles of Pestalozzi, Owen and Ushinsky appear in this series of '100 Thinkers on Education'.

3. Profiles of Blonsky and Krupskaya appear in this series of '100 Thinkers on Education'.
4. Anton Makarenko, [*Collected Works in Seven Volumes*], 2nd ed., Vol. IV, p. 20, Moscow, 1957.
5. Anton Makarenko, Izbrannye pedagogičeskie sočinenia [*Collected Educational Works* (in two volumes)], Vol. I, Moscow, Pegadogika, 1977, p. 258.
6. Ibid., p. 261.
7. Ibid., p. 13.
8. Ibid., p. 14.
9. Ibid., p. 37.
10. Ibid., p. 73.
11. See A. A. Frolov, 'Unpublished Archive Material as a Source for Study of the Experience and Theoretical Views of A. S. Makarenko', in *Pedagogičeskoe nasledie A. S. Makarenko i sovremennaja škola* [The Educational Legacy of A. S. Makarenko and Modern Education], pp. 81-6, Voronezh, 1981.

Works by Anton Makarenko (published mainly after 1980)

Prepared by Y. A. Alferov

COLLECTED WORKS

Pedagogičeskie sočinenija v vos'mi tomah [Educational Works in Eight Volumes]. Moscow, 1983-86. 8 vols.:

1. *Pedagogičeskie sočinenija*, 1922-1936 [Educational Works, 1922-36], 1983. 366 pp.
2. *Čest': Povest'; Mazhor: P'esa; Marš 30-go goda: Očerk; FD-I: Očerk* [The Honour: A Novel; In the Major Key: A Play; The March of the Thirties: An Essay; FD-I: An Essay]. 1983. 512 pp.
3. *Pedagogičeskaja poema* [An Educational Poem]. 1983. 511 pp. (Sometimes also translated into English as 'A Road to Life'.)
4. *Pedagogičeskie proizvedenija, 1936-1939, vključaja: Lekcii o vospitanii detej Problemy škil'nogo sovetskogo vospitanija i dr.* [Educational Works, 1936-39, including: Lectures on the Education of Children; Problems of School Soviet Education, etc.]. 1984. 399 pp.
5. *Kniga dlja roditelej* [A Book for Parents]. 1985. 333 pp.
6. *Flagi na bašnjah: Rasskazy* [Flags on the Battlements: A Novel; Short Stories]. 1985. 384 pp.
7. *Publicističeskie proizvedenija, scenarii, recenzii, stat'i o detskoj literature, o pisatel'skom trude, 1934-1939* [Publicity, Literary Scripts, Reviews, Articles about Children's Literature, about the Writer's Work, 1934-39]. 1986. 319 pp.
8. *Pis'ma. Documentary biografičeskogo haractera. Materialy pedagogičeskoj i literaturnoj dejatel'nosti* [Letters. Documents of a Biographical Nature. Materials of Educational and Literary Activities]. 1986. 335 pp.

Izbrannye prozvedenija v četyreh tomah [Selected Works in Four Volumes]. Moscow, 1987.

Izbrannye proizvedenija v treh tomah [Selected Works in Three Volumes]. Kiev, 1985.

Sobranie sočinenij v semi tomah [Collected Works in Seven Volumes]. 2nd ed. Moscow, 1959/60.

Pädagogische Werke [Educational Works]. Berlin, Volk & Wissen, 1988/89. 3 vols.

Makarenko antologia [A Makarenko Anthology]. (Ed. by Dr Petrikas Arpad.) Budapest, 1986.

Selected Pedagogical Works. Moscow, Progress, 1990. 432 pp.

INDIVIDUAL WORKS

Pedagogičeskaja poema [An Educational Poem]. Moscow, 1988. (Also published in: Irkutsk, 1980; Kharkov, 1981; Kiev, 1988; Leningrad, 1981; Minsk, 1982; Moscow, 1987; Novosibirsk, 1988, etc.; *Vejen til livet*. Copenhagen, 1988; *Pedagogiai hösköltemeny*. Budapest, 1988; *Poema pedagogica*. Moscow, Progress, 1985; *Poème pédagogique*. Moscow, Raduga, 1989.)

Flagi na bašnjah [Flags on the Battlements]. Moscow, 1986.

Kniga dlja roditelej [A Book for Parents]. Moscow, 1988. (Also published in: Kiev, 1987; Leningrad, 1981; Novosibirsk, 1983; Rostov-on-Don, 1981; *Flores de la vida: El libro para los padres*. Mexico City, Cartago, 1983; *En bok för föräldrar*. Göteborg, Fram, 1985.)

Conferencias sobre educación infantil [Lectures on the Education of Children]. Bogotá, Anteo, 1980.

Problemas de educação escolar: Experiencia do trabalho pedagogico, 1920-1935 [Problems of Formal Education: Experience of Educational Work, 1920-35]. Moscow, Progress, 1986.

Makarensko y la educación colectivista [Makarenko and Collective Education]. (Anthology prepared by M. Hernández and L. M. Valdivia.) Mexico City, El Cabaletto, 1985.

Works about Anton Makarenko (published after 1980)

Frolov, A. A. *A. S. Makarenko: osnovy pedagogičeskoj sistemy* [A. S. Makarenko: The Foundations of an Education System]. Gorky, 1990.

——, (ed.). *A. S. Makarenko segodnja* [A. S. Makarenko Today]. Nizhniy Novgorod, 1992.

——. *A. S. Makarenko. Ukazatel' trudov i literatury o zhizni i dejatel'nosti. K stoletiju so dnja rozhdenija* [A. S. Makarenko: Bibliographical Index of His Works and of the Literature about His Life and Work. In Commemoration of the 100th Anniversary of his Birth]. Moscow, 1988.

Hillig, G. Die Verbreitung der Werke A. S. Makarenko ausserhalb der Sowjetunion [Dissemination of A. S. Makarenko's Works Outside the Soviet Union]. *Pädagogische Rundschau* (Frankfurt/Main), 1980, No. 1.

Jarmačenko, N. D. *Pedagogičeskaja dejatel'nost' i tvorčeskoe nasledie A. S. Makarenko* [The Educational Work and the Creative Legacy of A. S. Makarenko]. Kiev, 1989.

——. *Razvitie idej A. S. Makarenko v teorii i metodike vospitanija* [The Development of A. S. Makarenko's Ideas in the Theory of Educational Methodology]. Moscow, 1989.

Kozlov, I. F. *Pedagogičeskij opyt A. S. Makarenko: kniga dlja učitelja* [The Educational Experience of A. S. Makarenko: A Book for Teachers]. Moscow, 1987.

Murto, K. *Towards the Well-functioning Community*. Jyväskylä, 1991.

——. *A. S. Makarenko: Pedagog, spisovatel, člověk* [A. S. Makarenko: Educator, Writer, Man]. Prague, 1988.

Pataki, F.; Hillig, G. *Samoutverzhdenie ili konformizm? K voprosu ideino-političeskogo stanovlenija A. S. Makarenko* [Self-affirmation or Conformism? On the Question of A. S. Makarenko's Ideological and Political Formation]. Marburg, 1987.

Pavlova, M. P. *Pedagogičeskaja sistema A. S. Makarenko i sovremennost'* [The Education System of A. S. Makarenko and the Present]. Moscow, n.d.

——. *Pedagogičeskoe nasledie A. S. Makarenko i sovremennaja škola* [The Educational Legacy of A. S. Makarenko and Today's School]. Voronezh, 1981; Kishinev, 1987.

Rüttenauer, I. *A. S. Makarenko. Ein Erzieher und Schriftsteller in der Sowjetgesellschaft* [A. S. Makarenko: an Educator and Writer in Soviet Society]. Freiburg/Basle, 1965.

Sauermann, E. *Makarenko und Marx: Praktisches und Theoretisches über die Erziehung der Arbeiterjugend* [Makarenko and Marx: Theory and Practice of Education for Working Youth]. Berlin, 1987.

MAO ZEDONG

(1893–1976)

Zhuo Qingjun

The educational doctrine of Mao Zedong

Besides being a key figure of Marxism, and a great protagonist, strategist and theoretician of the proletarian revolution in China, Mao Zedong was also an important educator of the proletariat. With his extensive writings on education itself and his considerable practical experience of teaching, he paved the way for a specifically Chinese form of socialist education. The Chinese sum up his contribution to education in the phrase: 'The educational doctrine of Mao Zedong'.

Mao Zedong gradually developed and refined his educational doctrine on the basis of three main building blocks: (a) his personal experience of teaching; (b) Marxism; and (c) the very rich cultural heritage of the Chinese nation.

Mao Zedong was born on 26 December 1893; he died on 9 September 1976. Between 1914 and 1918 he received, over a period of five years, systematic teacher training at the First Provincial Normal School in Hunan province. While studying, he divided his time between revolutionary and educational activities. Throughout his life he would continue to accumulate valuable experience as an educational practitioner and theorist.

During an early period, 1917–27, his educational activities were as follows: in 1917, he founded a night school for workers, where he taught history. In August 1918, he organized the departure of fellow Chinese students who were going to France on a combined work-and-study scheme. In the autumn of that year, he was appointed assistant librarian at the University of Beijing. In June 1919, the Hunan student association was set up under his dynamic guidance. In June 1920, he was appointed administrator (head teacher) and Chinese-language teacher of the primary school attached to the First Provincial Teacher-Training School of Hunan. In August 1921, he founded the Open University of Hunan. In December, he became secretary of the Chinese Communist Party Committee of Hunan province and a member of the secretariat of the worker's movement in the province. In addition, he established a night school for workers in Changsha.

In 1925, he carried out an investigation in the Hunan countryside; by the end of the following year, peasant associations had been set up in over half the province's seventy-five districts and more than twenty night schools for rural dwellers had been opened on his initiative. In May 1926, he became principal of the Canton Peasant Movement Training Institute, where he taught three courses on the peasant question in China, education in the countryside and geography. In March 1927, he left to run the Central Peasant Movement Training Institute in Wuchang.

The agrarian revolutionary struggle (1929-37) was an opportunity for the Chinese Communist Party to gain useful experience in the autonomous organization of education. During this period, Mao Zedong was personally involved in teaching at the Red Army Academy and organized the political, military and cultural training of officers and soldiers. He was also Director of the Soviet University where a great many cadres were trained to meet an urgent need in the soviet region of Jiangxi.

During the war of resistance against Japan and the war of liberation (1937-49), Mao Zedong, who was already extremely busy leading the revolutionary struggle and carrying out many other tasks, nevertheless continued to supervise revolutionary education directly, chaired the Pedagogical Committee of the Anti-Japanese Military and Political College and made a significant personal contribution by holding classes and developing teaching aids. Education made rapid strides in all the revolutionary bases. In the Shanxi–Gansu–Ningxia border region, for instance, there were originally only three secondary schools and 120 primary schools. In 1946, the number of primary schools had increased dramatically to 2,990; there were seven secondary schools; and all sorts of other institutions had been opened, including the Anti-Japanese Military and Political College, the North Shanxi Public School, the Central Party School, the Marx-Lenin Institute, the Women's University, the Yan'an University, the Lu Xun Art Institute, the Young Cadres Training Institute, the Norman Bethune School of Medicine, the Institute of Natural Sciences and the School of Administration. Mao Zedong lectured in many of them.

Following the founding of the People's Republic of China, Mao Zedong produced a prompt definition of a policy to establish and develop mass education, together with significant measures to that end: he himself also inspected schools, made contact with educators and read and approved important documents on education. Under his guidance, teaching flourished and broke new ground.

It is therefore clear that his extensive teaching experience had a strong influence in shaping his educational doctrine, since it provided him with practical experience. All these activities took place at a time when history was being made through the struggle for the victory of the revolution and the construction of a new society.

The educational doctrine of Mao Zedong is thus broadly based on both aspects of his revolutionary experience.

The theoretical foundations

At the beginning of his active life, Mao Zedong was strongly opposed to the feudal warlords and the imperialists, but his political ideas were still imbued with liberalism, democratic reformism and Utopian socialism. Very soon, however, his revolutionary activities, especially at the time of the May Fourth Movement and the New Culture Movement, led him to discover new ideas. In particular, he frequented the Marxist research circle founded by the precursor of Communism in China, Li Dazhao, where his political thought gradually took shape. In 1920, Mao Zedong read *The Communist Manifesto* of Marx and Engels, from which he drew the initial premises of his stance and his method. These works, he said, 'built up in me a faith in Marxism from which, once I had accepted it as the correct interpretation of history, I did not afterwards waver'.[1] He also declared that 'by the summer of 1920 I had become, in theory and to some extent in action, a Marxist'.[2] From then on, his activities were inextricably linked to the growth of the Chinese Communist Party and its subsequent development in the face of many complications and obstacles.

Besides Marx, another person – Lenin – exerted a relatively strong influence on the formation of the political thought of Mao Zedong. By 1926, he had read some passages of *The State and Revolution* for himself or had become acquainted with it through quotations or digests by other writers. In addition to *The State and Revolution*, the works of Lenin which he was to read most assiduously during his lifetime included: *Two Tactics of Social Democracy; 'Left-Wing' Communism: An Infantile Disorder; Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism* and, when they were published, the *Philosophical Notebooks*. He was looking for theoretical guidance in Lenin's works on how to lead the democratic revolution in China, and then move on to the stage of socialist revolution. He immersed himself in Marxist philosophy.[3]

It must be emphasized that it was Marxism, and more particularly Marxist philosophy, that constituted the theoretical foundation of the educational doctrine of Mao Zedong.

China's cultural heritage

Mao Zedong valued the outstanding cultural heritage of China. He believed that over several millennia, from Confucius to Sun Yatsen, the Chinese people had created a magnificent civilization which they should both appreciate and take further, in a spirit of critical awareness, retaining its best features and rejecting the worthless.[4] He was against 'wholesale Westernization'. These were the principles that informed his educational activities from that early stage. For example, when he founded the Open University of Hunan, he sought to emulate both traditional Chinese schools and modern institutions. Cai Yuanpei, a famous educationist of the time, praised the university which, he said, 'combined the traditions of Chinese schools and Western research institutes', and should serve as a 'model

for the new universities in every province'.[5] It was thus the spiritual wealth of the extraordinary civilization of the Chinese nation which found expression in the basic tenets of Mao Zedong's considerable contribution to education.

Writings and ideas prior to 1949

The period leading up to the Communist victory in 1949 can be divided into two parts – before and after 1927.

Before Mao discovered Marxism, his main writings on education were: 'A Study of Physical Education', an article published in April 1917 in *Xin Qingnian* [New Youth], Vol. 3, No. 2; 'Appeal to Register at the Night School for Workers' in November 1917; the manifesto written to launch the journal *Xianjiang pinglun* [The Hunan Review]; 'The Great Alliance of the Popular Masses', an article published on 21 July 1919 in the second issue of the journal; and 'Students' Work' of December 1919. These writings are wholly typical of the broadsides delivered by Mao against the old teaching methods which destroyed the personality, against their authoritarianism and the cultural aggression of imperialism and feudal education. They expressed his belief that it was essentially through education that society could be transformed. In 'A Study of Physical Education', he commented: 'In the school system of our country, the syllabuses are as thick as the hairs on a cow. Even an adult, with a strong body, would be unable to bear them all – how much less an adolescent with a weak constitution?' In the statement he wrote for the first issue of *Xianjiang pinglun*, he showed how the authoritarian nature of education, the bastion of bureaucrats who exercised a fierce monopoly over it, meant that ordinary people did not have the opportunity to educate themselves, and he called for a campaign to recognize the right of the masses to education. In 'Students' work', he stated that in order to transform society, new communities should be built on a triple basis — new family, new school, new society. In this Utopian vision of a Mao who had yet to embrace Marxist doctrine, the educational point of view tends to be the only yardstick of his thought, so that education's function as a tool is overestimated.

After his espousal of Marxism in 1920, his writings on education consist of a letter to Xiao Xudong, Xiao (Cai) Linbin and all his friends in France, the 'Manifesto on the Occasion of the Founding of the Open University of Hunan' and the section of his 'Report of an Investigation into the Peasant Movement in Hunan' relating to the movement's cultural achievements and experience. His writings of this period prompt two observations. First, Mao Zedong's concept of the social function of education had clearly evolved. In the above-mentioned letter, he states clearly: 'We acknowledge honestly that education is the instrument of the revolution, but do not draw any practical conclusion from that. We must follow the path of the Russian revolution.'[6] Second, in the 'Report of an Investigation into the Peasant Movement in Hunan', he analyses relations between culture and power, in the belief that there will be no genuine peasant

culture until those in power have been overthrown, and he criticized the reformists who claimed to be able to save the country through education:

> In China, culture has always been the exclusive possession of the landowners, and the peasants had no access to it. . . . With the downfall of the power of the landowners in the rural areas, the peasants' cultural movement has begun. . . . Before long there will be tens of thousands of schools sprouting up in the rural areas throughout the whole province, and that will be something quite different from the futile clamour of the intelligentsia and so-called 'educators' for 'popular education', which for all their hullabaloo has remained an idle phrase.

Mao Zedong began to set up a system of mass education adapted to Chinese conditions. In his 'Manifesto on the Occasion of the Founding of the Open University of Hunan', he made a down-to-earth analysis of Eastern and Western culture and of traditional and modern schools, and using these as starting-points described a 'new system'.

No special qualifications were needed to register at the Open University. The abolition of that unjustified restriction and the elimination or reduction of registration fees in order to break the monopoly of the wealthy, democratize knowledge, free people from the domination of the 'education clique' and unite manual workers and intellectuals – all these show that Mao was already committed to popular education.[7] The 'Report of an Investigation into the Peasant Movement in Hunan' stated as a principle the need to adopt a practical approach in peasant education.

> The teaching materials used in the rural primary schools all dealt with city matters and were in no way adapted to the needs of the rural areas. Besides, the primary-school teachers behaved badly towards the peasants, who, far from finding them helpful, grew to dislike them.

He praised the schools set up by the peasants which, he says, are the only ones they regard 'as their own'.[8]

After 1927, the Chinese Communist Party created an independent revolutionary base and a democratic workers' and peasants' regime; its practical work for the revolution (in particular education) went considerably further than in the preceding period. Mao Zedong therefore had an opportunity to put his educational ideas into practice on a larger scale, particularly following his appointment to lead the Party and the Army at the Zunyi Conference (1935). His ideas were gradually becoming more structured and mature.

Mao Zedong's writings of this period dealing with education include the following: 'Resolution Drafted for the Ninth Conference of the Party Organization for the Fourth Corps of the Red Army'; 'Report of the Central Executive Committee and the Council of People's Commissars of the Chinese Soviet Republic to the Second All-China Soviet Congress'; 'On New Democracy'; 'The Orientation of the Youth Movement'; 'Directives of the Council of Military Affairs of the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party on the

Question of the Reorganization of the Anti-Japanese College'; 'Draw in Large Numbers of Intellectuals'; 'Reform Our Study'; 'Rectify the Party's Style in Work'; 'Oppose the Party "Eight-legged Essay"'; 'In Memory of Norman Bethune'; and 'Serve the People'. Mao Zedong's two great philosophical works, 'On Practice' and 'On Contradiction', as well as, for instance, his 'Talks at the Yenan Forum on Art and Literature' are also important pieces of writing for the study of his educational doctrine. The main points of the doctrine were as follows:

1. *At this stage in history, education should be a matter for the new democracy.* 'Before the May 4 Movement, the struggle on China's cultural front was a struggle between the new culture of the bourgeoisie and the old culture of the feudal class. Before the May 4 Movement, the struggles between the modern school system and the imperial competitive examination system, between new learning and old learning, and between Western learning and Chinese learning, all partook of this character. . . . Since the May 4 Movement, [the new culture of China] has become a culture of the new-democratic character and a part of the socialist cultural revolution of the world proletariat.'[9]
2. *Education is tied to politics and to the economy.* 'Any given culture (culture as an ideological form) is a reflection of the politics and economy of a given society, while it has in turn a tremendous influence and effect upon the politics and economy of the given society; economy is the basis, and politics is the concentrated expression of economy.'[10] During the revolutionary war years, he stressed, education must be subordinate to, and part of, the war effort.
3. *Elaboration of guidelines on education.* In the 'Report of the Central Executive Committee and the Council of People's Commissars of the Chinese Soviet Republic to the Second All-China Soviet Congress', he stated that education in the soviet zone must generally be aimed at educating the toiling masses in a Communist spirit, harnessing popular education to the revolutionary war and the class struggle, linking study and work, and ensuring that every individual in the teeming Chinese masses has access to the joys of culture.[11] Continuing the introduction of the guiding principles of popular education for the new democracy, he writes: 'So far as national culture is concerned, the guiding role is fulfilled by Communist ideology, and efforts should be made to disseminate socialism and communism among the working class and to educate, properly and methodically, the peasantry and other sections of the masses in socialism. But national culture as a whole is at present not yet socialist.' The culture of the new democracy 'is the anti-imperialist, anti-feudal culture . . . of the people'; it is national, it is scientific and it belongs to the people.[12]
4. *Vigorous confirmation of the principle of the link between theory and practice.* In 'Reform Our Study', he emphasized the need to abide by that principle and severely criticized subjectivist attitudes isolated from practice. 'In schools and in the spare-time education of cadres, teachers of philosophy do not guide the students to study the logic of the Chinese revolution; teachers of

economics do not guide them to study the characteristic features of Chinese economy; teachers of political science do not guide them to study the tactics of the Chinese revolution; teachers of military science do not guide them to study the strategy and tactics fit for China's special conditions, and so on and so forth. The result is that errors are disseminated to the great harm of the people.' He added: 'As to the spare-time education for cadres and cadres' training schools, we should make it our central task to study the practical problems of the Chinese revolution'. In 'Rectify the Party's Style in Work', he wrote: 'They proceed from a primary school of that sort to a university of that sort, they take a diploma, and are regarded as stocked with knowledge. But all that they have is knowledge of books, and they have not yet taken part in any practical activities, nor have they applied, in any branch of social life, the knowledge they have acquired . . . their knowledge is not yet complete. What, then, is comparatively complete knowledge? All comparatively complete knowledge is acquired through two stages: first the stage of perceptual knowledge and second the stage of rational knowledge, the latter being the development of the former to a higher plane.' Furthermore, 'the most important thing is [to] be well versed in applying such knowledge in life and in practice'.

5. *The recommendation that education and production should go hand in hand.* He called on the schools to launch a large-scale movement for production and to encourage young people to unite with the workers and peasants. He wrote: 'Public bodies, schools and army units should . . . make great efforts to grow vegetables and breed pigs, collect firewood, make charcoal, develop handicrafts and raise a part of the grain they need. Apart from the development of collective production in all the big and small units, all individuals (except those in the army) should at the same time be encouraged to devote their spare time to minor agricultural or handicraft production.'[13] Work, production and study must go together.
6. *With regard to young people, priority shall be given to the acquisition of a solid and correct political stance.* Mao Zedong personally addressed the following recommendation to the Anti-Japanese College: 'A firm and correct political stance, hard work and strategy and tactics that are readily adaptable – these should be the main themes of teaching in the schools.'[14] He also asked the students to be 'ready at any moment to sacrifice everything they own in the cause of the people's liberation.'[15]
7. *Unqualified confirmation of the role of the intellectuals.* He often returned to this theme: at the time of the democratic revolutionary movement in China, the intellectuals had been the first to become politically aware. 'The great masses of China's revolutionary intellectuals . . . serve as a spearhead or a bridge. No success can be achieved in organizing the revolutionary forces and carrying on revolutionary work without the participation of the revolutionary intellectuals.'[16] In the text entitled 'Draw in Large Numbers of Intellectuals', he wrote that adopting a correct policy towards the intellectuals is one of the keys to the victory of the revolution. And elsewhere: 'Our Party should . . .

adopt a careful attitude towards students, teachers, professors, scientific workers, art workers and ordinary intellectuals. We should unite with them, educate them and give them posts according to the merits of each case'.[17] At the same time, Mao stressed repeatedly that it was absolutely vital for the intellectuals to ally themselves with the workers and peasants, the better to fulfil their mission and gain the acceptance of the masses.

8. *Educational activities must, of necessity, follow the line of the masses.* He constantly recalled the two principles that popular education should observe: 'first, what the masses actually need rather than what we imagine they need; and, second, what the masses are willing and determined to do rather than what we are determined to do on their behalf'.[18] Hence, Mao Zedong always recommended that methods of running schools should be diversified, the education system reformed and school curricula redesigned to adapt them to the needs of the masses, who should be mobilized and organized on a wide scale so as to become involved in the management of education.

These were the main features of education for a new democracy as Mao Zedong envisaged it at the time. The doctrine played a major historical role during that period and even now is central to education policy.

The evolution of his educational doctrine

After the founding of the People's Republic of China, Mao Zedong, who was now leading the socialist revolution and the building of socialism, took education for the new democracy as his starting-point in order actively to explore ways of establishing socialist education adapted to the distinctive characteristics of China. His plan was composed of three stages: reform of the old education system; establishment and development of a new socialist education system; and 'cultural revolution'. Among Mao's documents on education and the texts and documents written by him or on his instructions, or endorsed by him, which considerably influenced education during this period, the following deserve particular mention: the 'Common Programme Adopted by the People's Political Consultative Conference'; 'Letter to Ma Xulun on the Need to Ensure the Good Health of School Pupils and Students'; 'In Its Work, the Communist Youth League Must Take into Consideration the Characteristics of Young People'; 'Notes on the Growth of Socialism in the Chinese Countryside'; 'On the Ten Major Relationships'; 'On the Correct Handling of Contradictions Among the People'; 'Interviews with Chairman Mao and the Heads of Departments and Bureaux of Seven Provinces and Towns'; 'Speech to the National Conference of the Chinese Communist Party on Propaganda Work'; 'Directives on the Educational Activities of the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party and the State Affairs Council'; 'Letter on the Jiangxi University of Communist Workers'; 'Draft Provisional Working Regulations of the Ministry of Education Concerning Higher Educational Institutions', approved by the Party's Central Committee; 'Draft Provisional Working Regulations for Full-time Primary

Schools' and 'Draft Provisional Working Regulations for Full-time Secondary Schools' decreed by the Central Committee; 'Speech to the Spring Festival Symposium'; and 'Speech to the Hangzhou Conference'. At this time, Mao's educational doctrine went through a new phase of development whose principal aspects were as follows:

1. *Education must be put to work to build socialism.* On the eve of the founding of the People's Republic of China, in his opening address to the first plenary session of the People's Political Consultative Conference, Mao Zedong said: 'Cultural change will follow economic change with the same forward impetus.' He therefore attached great importance to education. On the very day of the establishment of the People's Republic of China, the 'Common Programme', which laid down the political measures to be taken by the People's Government, and which had been adopted by the Consultative Conference and announced by Mao, set out a raft of measures on education and confirmed the need for properly planned reform of the old education system, and the need to develop all forms of teaching systematically so as to meet the vast range of needs engendered by revolutionary activities and nation-building. In 1955, when the movement to create socialist co-operatives in the countryside was in full swing, Mao Zedong observed the striking contradiction between the backward nature of the education system and the will to build socialism. He stressed the need to solve the problem of introducing universal education in such circumstances by making the co-operatives work for education, and the necessity of clarifying the connection between education and the reform of the socio-economic system. In all his subsequent writings – directives on education, training objectives, texts on the scope and pace of development and on the form and content of education – this desire to contribute to the building of socialism was apparent.
2. *The purpose was to develop socialist action comprehensively.* In 'On the Correct Handling of Contradictions Among the People', Mao Zedong indicated this clearly: every beneficiary of education must be enabled 'to develop morally, intellectually and physically and become a cultured, socialist-minded worker'. He repeatedly emphasized that young school pupils must in the first place acquire firm and correct political views, striving to be both 'Red and expert'. He also had great faith in intellectual training. School pupils must, he insisted, take an active and dynamic part in their education. He said repeatedly that courses should be made less burdensome, examinations reformed, pupils no longer treated as enemies to be brutally dominated, teaching methods reviewed and a suitable teaching approach adopted. For example, on 10 May 1964, he replied in these terms to a letter sent to him the previous month by the Principal of Beijing Railway Secondary School No. 2, Wei Lianyi: 'Today, classes are overcrowded and the pupils subjected to too much pressure. The teaching also leaves much to be desired. Examinations are approached as if the pupils were enemies who must be attacked by surprise. All this discourages young people from energetically taking charge of their

own moral, intellectual and physical education.'[19] Mao was also greatly concerned by the health of school pupils. Immediately after the establishment of the People's Republic of China, he wrote twice to the Minister of Education, Ma Xulun, pressing for the schools to be given the following instructions: 'Health first, studies second.' He returned to that theme on many occasions: 'We must ensure that young people are in good health, study well and work hard.' A balance must be struck between studies on the one hand, and, on the other hand, relaxation, rest and sleep.[20]

3. *The new education system combined education and productive labour.* After the establishment of the People's Republic, education remained for a while divorced from productive labour and practical work, and it also to some extent neglected the study of politics. The 'Directive on Educational Activities' issued in 1958 by the Central Committee of the Communist Party and the State Affairs Council was expressly intended to remedy that situation. It stated that as far as education was concerned, the Party should as a matter of principle put education at the disposal of proletarian politics and combine it with productive labour. In every school, productive labour must be regarded as a discipline in its own right. The line to follow henceforth was that schools should be run like factories and farms, and factories and agricultural co-operatives should be run like schools. The same document authorized the establishment of schools where studies alternated with work (work-study schools). From then on, work and education went hand in hand, productive labour developed vigorously within education and a wide variety of new types of establishment were introduced, such as agricultural secondary schools.
4. *'You need both legs for walking', meaning that resources should be used to their full potential, and forms of teaching diversified.* The revised draft of the 'National Programme for the Development of Agriculture from 1956 to 1967', prepared by Mao Zedong himself and adopted in 1957 by the Party's Central Committee, stated that educational establishments must be diversified in the countryside and that, in addition to national public education, every effort must be made to provide the masses with education organized by local communities and to authorize private schools. The above-mentioned 1958 'Directive on Educational Activities' contained more specific and detailed instructions. It stipulated that in order to develop education more rapidly, on a larger scale, as well as better and more cheaply, unity and diversification must be combined, as must generalization and improvement, overall planning and the sharing of responsibilities at the local level. Within the limits of the national objective of consistent teaching, the methods used to run schools must be diversified by developing simultaneously the role of the State and the role of factories, mines, companies and agricultural co-operatives, popular education and technical and vocational education, adult education and children's education, full-time schools and work-study and spare-time schools, independent study (including correspondence courses and educational radio

programmes), free education and fee-paying education.[21] Thanks to the adoption of that principle, education in China made relatively rapid progress.

5. *China must go its own way*, while drawing inspiration from the positive achievements of all nations. Mao Zedong always maintained that it was crucial to establish policy on the basis of one's own strengths and to look for a path of development adapted to the specific situation of a country. He proceeded on that basis throughout his life, whether he was involved in revolution or construction. At the same time, he allowed room for the utilization of foreign experience, but always taking into account the distinctive characteristics of China. In 'On the Ten Major Relationships', he wrote that the strong points of each nation and each country must be studied – that is, every genuine achievement that had been made in politics, the economy, science, technology, culture, literature, and the arts – but that this must be done discerningly and in a critical frame of mind, taking care not to copy blindly and implement unthinkingly.[22] In a further article he explained that the mistakes which accounted for the backwardness of some countries must also be analysed, in order to avoid committing them in the same way. In the field of knowledge and science the slogan must be: 'Let a hundred flowers bloom and a hundred schools of thought contend.'
6. *It was the responsibility of the Party to guide education.* Mao Zedong not only made a personal commitment to education but believed that at every level – province, region, district – the first secretary of the Party Committee should make a similar commitment. It would be unacceptable for him or her to appear to neglect it. Mao said on numerous occasions that the training of school cadres by the Party must be strengthened in order to ensure that the schools were well run. In 1957, the Central Committee decided to transfer 1,000 high- and medium-ranking cadres from the central political bodies into the universities, secondary schools and some scientific and literary teaching units so as to reinforce the Party's leading role on the education front. Education could be firmly controlled only if it was resolutely guided by Marxism. He also stressed this many times during the building of socialism.
7. *Educators must be trained before they start work and intellectuals must be encouraged to make common cause with the workers and peasants.* 'Being experts and educators, their first duty is to educate themselves. . . . They must learn from producers - workers and peasants. . . . If the intellectuals join forces with the workers and peasants and become their friends, they will be able to assimilate the Marxism they have learnt in books. . . . It is not enough to learn Marxism by studying it in books; it is above all through the class struggle, practical work and contact with the worker and peasant masses that one can really make it one's own.'[23]

Taking stock

Mao Zedong took part in educational work and indeed directed it himself. His educational doctrine was forged in the heat of the Chinese revolution and the construction of the nation, and accordingly bears their stamp. Equally, the doctrine embodies the wisdom of other leaders and the people at large. The revolution and socialist construction have great achievements to their credit, despite difficulties, errors and complications. The same is true of education. For instance, between 1957 and 1966, the first decade of building socialism in every field, the country's leading authorities accumulated sound experience. This is one of the main features of their activity.

However, serious mistakes were also made. The excesses of the 'leftist' deviation were reflected for a while in education by too rapid a pace of development. Intellectuals were criticized too harshly for holding certain scientific points of view. The ten-year 'Cultural Revolution' caused China to suffer extremely serious reverses and losses. Mao Zedong made erroneous judgements on class contradictions and the class struggle in relation to education. Claiming that bourgeois intellectuals dominated education, he called for no effort to be spared in criticizing and unmasking the so-called 'capitalist-roaders' and other 'prominent reactionaries', and for classes to be stopped in order to make 'revolution'. The result was that education was severely disrupted.

Nevertheless, if we take stock of his life, it is clear that his contribution to the Chinese revolution and the construction of the country far outweighs his mistakes. His merits should be pushed into the limelight and his faults kept in the background. This also applies to education. Mao's educational doctrine is a rich and valuable contribution to the history of education in China. It not only led the Chinese people to set out on an original path of socialist education during the stages of new neo-democratic revolution, socialist revolution and construction, but even today it has far-reaching significance for fundamental principles and general philosophy. It is important to study this doctrine, not merely in order to make a scientific summary of what it can teach us about the experience of modern China in the field of education and a realistic assessment of Mao Zedong's position in history, but also to pursue and develop his thought in the new historical phase of socialist modernization, while continuing to advance steadfastly towards socialist education, Chinese-style.

Notes

1. Edgar Snow, *Red Star over China*, p. 155, New York, Grove Press, 1968.
2. Ibid.
3. Gong Yuzhi, Feng Xianzhi and Shi Zhongjia, *Mao Zedong de dushu shenghuo* [The Studies of Mao Zedong], pp. 23-24, Beijing, San Lian Press.
4. Profiles of Confucius and Sun Yatsen are included in this series of '100 Thinkers on Education'.

5. *Cai Yuanpei jiaoyu wenxuan* [Selected Texts by Cai Yuanpei on Education], p. 162, Renmin jiaoyu chubanshe, 1980. A profile of Cai Yuanpei is included in this series of '100 Thinkers on Education'.
6. *Zhongguo xiandai shi ziliao congkan 'xinmin xuehui ziliao'* [Documents of the New People's Institute, Collection of Documents on the History of Modern China], pp. 147-50, Renmin chubanshe, 1980.
7. 'Hunan zixiu daxue chuangli xuanyan' [Manifesto on the Occasion of the Foundation of the Open University of Hunan], *Xin shidai* [New Era], Vol. 1, No. 1.
8. Mao Zedong, 'Report of an Investigation into the Peasant Movement in Hunan', *Selected Works of Mao Tse-tung*, Vol. 1, p. 56-57, Beijing, People's Publishing House, 1969. (London, Lawrence & Wishart, 1955. San Francisco, China Books, 1961.)
9. 'On New Democracy', *Selected Works*, op. cit., Vol. 3, pp. 143, 144-45.
10. Ibid., p. 107.
11. *Suweiai Zhongguo* [Soviet China], p. 285. Reprinted by the commission to compile documents relating to the history of modern China.
12. Ibid., n. 8, pp. 152-53.
13. 'Spread in the Base Areas the Campaign for Rent Reduction, for Production, and for the Army's Support of the Government and Protection of the People', *Selected Works of Mao Tse-tung*, op. cit., Vol. 4, p. 127.
14. 'Kangda san zhounian jinian' [Celebration of the Third Anniversary of the Anti-Japanese College], *Xin Zhonghua bao*, 30 May 1935.
15. Foreword to *Kangda wu zhounian jinian tekan* (Special Edition to Celebrate the Fifth Anniversary of the Anti-Japanese College), May 1941.
16. 'The Chinese Revolution and the Chinese Communist Party', *Selected Works*, op. cit., Vol. 3, p. 91.
17. 'On Some Important Problems of the Party's Present Policy', ibid., Vol. 5, p. 184.
18. 'The United Front in Cultural Work', ibid., op. cit., Vol. 4, p. 227.
19. *Zhonghua renmin gongheguo dashi ji 1949-1982* [Chronicle of the People's Republic of China, 1949-82], *Jiaoyu Kexue* (Central Research Institute for Educational Sciences), 1984.
20. Mao Zedong, 'The Action of the Youth Organizations Must Respond to the Specific Concerns of Young People', in: *Selected Works*, op. cit., Vol. 5,
21. Ibid., n. 18.
22. Mao Zedong, 'On the Ten Major Relationships', in: *Selected Works*, op. cit., Vol. 5.
23. Mao Zedong, 'Speech to the National Conference of the Chinese Communist Party on Propaganda Work', ibid., Vol. 5.

Works about Mao Zedong

Guo Sheng (ed.). *Xin Zhongghuo jiaoyu sishi nian* [Ten Years of Education in the New China]. Fujian jiaoyu chubanshe, 1989.

He Dongchang. Zai jiaoyu gangzuo zhong jianchi he fazhan Mao Zedong sixiang. *Jiaoyu yanjiu* [Studies in Education], 1984, No. 5.

Resolution of the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party Concerning Some Historic Problems that Have Arisen for the Party since the Establishment of the New China, adopted on 27 June 1981.

Sun Xiting. *Guanyu Mao Zedong tongzhi jiaoyu sixiang de yanjiu* [Study of the Educational Doctrine of Comrade Mao Zedong].

Zheng Derong et al. (eds.). *Xin Zhongguo jishi 1949-1984* [Chronicle of the New China, 1949-84]. Dongbei shifan daxue chubanshe, 1986.

Zhuo Qingjun (ed.). *Zhongguo gaige quanshu - Jiaoyu gaige juan* [Survey of Reform in China. Education]. Dalian chubanshe, 1992.

JOSÉ MARTÍ [1]

(1853–95)

Ricardo Nassif

The life, work and thought of the Cuban educator José Martí may be viewed from many different angles. Our intention here is to present a profile of him as an educator and to outline his main educational ideas. The greatness of his style is revealed in everything that he produced, from the *versos sencillos* [simple verses] to the most impassioned of his revolutionary speeches, whereas his thoughts on education are scattered throughout his writings and emerge in the most unexpected places. However, their importance justifies examination, even though they are very often hidden away in his literary works or among his political ideas.

The teacher

Martí was a professional teacher only by accident, but it should be noted that his personality was so structured that what was incidental in him gave rise to the expression of permanent truths.

Martí was influenced by great figures such as José de la Luz y Caballero, whom he did not know personally, and Rafael María Mendive, who sowed within him the seeds of a humanistic vocation which never ceased to grow and develop.

José de la Luz had been the teacher of the generation that preceded Martí's and, as Martí himself admitted, taught him the fundamental lesson that 'sitting down to produce books, which is not difficult, is impossible when one is consumed by worry and anxiety and there is no time for the most difficult task of all, which is to produce men' (I, 854).[2] However, while de la Luz was a legendary figure, Mendive was for Martí a living example of a poet and teacher.

Martí received his early schooling in a small district school in Havana, but made such rapid progress that when he reached the age of 10 his parents decided to send him to a larger school where he could study English and accountancy. However, his family's means were so straitened that his father very soon decided

that 'he already knew enough', and took him away to work in the fields. At this point, one of his godparents insisted that he should be introduced to Mendive who, in 1865, had recently become principal of the Havana High School for Boys. In this school Mendive created such an atmosphere of poetry and learning that Martí felt that all his deepest longings in this respect were satisfied, while at the same time there was revealed to him 'his own creative activity which became conscious of itself as a result of such fruitful contacts'. In this atmosphere, he not only responded with enthusiasm to the life of sentiment and spirit, but also acted on occasion as teacher, taking on responsibility for the school during the absences of the principal.

With the assistance he received from Mendive he was able to complete the first two years of the secondary-school course, taking his leaving certificate at a later date in Spain, together with his university course. In Madrid he began his studies of law, philosophy and literature and, to eke out his financial resources, gained his first experience as a private tutor to two children when he was barely 18 years old.

From Madrid he went to Saragossa, where he obtained degrees in civil and canon law, philosophy and literature. From Saragossa he proceeded to Paris and then to England, before leaving for Mexico. It was in Mexico that he came into contact with the confrontation between romanticism and positivism; he attended the discussions held in 1875 in the Liceo Hidalgo, which provided a forum in which the ideas of the reformers Benito Juárez and Lerdo were aired. Martí took part in these discussions to outline some of the ideas he was to develop more fully at a later date.

Martí was in Mexico until the end of 1876, when he moved to Guatemala as a teacher of literature and composition at the Central Teacher Training College, whose principal was his fellow-countryman Izaguirre. He also taught German, French, English and Italian literature at the university. Notwithstanding the success of this teaching experience, which was the most systematic he ever acquired, in December 1878 he returned to Havana, where he was granted temporary permission to teach at the Hernández y Plasencia College of primary and secondary education. At the same time he was working part-time in a lawyer's office. A year later his teaching permit was withdrawn and he was forced to take up a minor position in law. However, as an indefatigable conspirator on behalf of Cuban independence, he was imprisoned for a second time (the first occasion had been when he was barely more than 16 years old). Subsequently he sailed again for Spain, and thereafter Paris and, in 1880, New York.

In 1881 he sought refuge in Venezuela where, soon after his arrival, the Colegio de Santo María employed him as a teacher of French language and literature. Guillermo Tell Villegas allowed him the use of classrooms where he was surrounded by students who, in the words of Lisazo,[3] felt themselves captivated by a kind of magic. However, this too was to come to an early end, since the President, Guzman Blanco, disapproved of this passionate Cuban who preached the doctrine of freedom so energetically.

Returning once more to New York, he began to work actively for his country's independence, displaying incredible energy and fighting spirit, which went hand in hand with boundless compassion. The result was the publication of *La edad del oro* [The Golden Age], 'a monthly publication for the entertainment and instruction of the children of America', as it was described on the cover of the first issue, which appeared in July 1889. Martí's language did not lose its beauty, neither did it fall into puerility or sentimentality, when addressed to children. This is shown by charming biographical studies such as *Tres héroes* [Three Heroes] (San Martin, Bolívar and Hidalgo); poetical gems such as *Dos milagros* [Two Miracles]; stories, such as the story of the man recounted by the houses he has lived in; translations of stories, such as *Meñique* [The Little Finger] or *El camarón encantado* [The Bewitched Shrimp]; adaptations from the *Iliad*, and many other works.

What was Martí trying to achieve with *La edad de oro*? He stated his intention himself in indicating those for whom the publication was intended:

> so that American children may know how people used to live, and how they live nowadays, in America and in other countries; how many things are made, such as glass and iron, steam engines and suspension bridges and electric light; so that when a child sees a coloured stone he will know why the stone is coloured. . . . We shall tell them about everything which is done in factories, where things happen which are stranger and more interesting than the magic in fairy stories. These things are real magic, more marvellous than any. . . . We write for children because it is they who know how to love, because it is children who are the hope for the world (II, pp. 1207-08).

La edad de oro ceased publication in October 1889. However, Martí's active feeling of compassion continued to find expression, and whereas previously children had been the object of his attention, it was now the turn of the poor. In New York, he became the driving force behind La Liga de la Instrucción [The League for Education] for Black workers, and he returned to teaching as a Spanish teacher at the Central High School.

It was in this way, while continuing his struggle for Cuban freedom, that his life was spent during the agitated period from 1890 to 1895. Finally, on 31 January 1895, he sailed from New York on a voyage from which he was never to return. Fighting for his country at the battle of Boca de Dos Ríos, he was killed on 19 May 1895. His death seems almost to have been a voluntary and creative act, such as he had always wished: 'as a good man, with my face to the sun'.

We have not attempted here to provide a full biography of the 'Cuban apostle', merely to indicate the periods during his life when he was able to work systematically as a schoolmaster and teacher. To sum up, it is clear that he had no time for the sort of teaching which was enclosed in the four walls of a classroom. Latin America was his real classroom, in which he was the supreme teacher as a liberator of peoples, though there always existed deep within him the other teacher who emerged only from time to time.

His educational ideas

Two factors help to explain the scant attention that has been paid to Martí's ideas.[4] In this first place – a characteristic which he shares with almost all those who helped to build Latin America – the thinker was overshadowed by the man of action, and it is hard when attempting to penetrate into the difficult terrain of purely intellectual matters not to be carried away by the charm of his humanity and poetry. The second factor is to be found in the interpretation of the term 'pedagogy', based on the relationship now being established between education and life. Seen from this approach, unknown to the educational theories of the past, Martí's personality and achievements form a whole, and everything he expressed in writing or in his political activity helps us to understand him as an educator and as an educational theorist.

In fact, he wrote comparatively little on pedagogy, though too much for it to be possible to give an exhaustive analysis in a brief profile such as this.

The idea of education

Among the many definitions that Martí gave of education, we have chosen the following:

> Education . . . is a way of equipping people to acquire a comfortable and honest livelihood in the world in which they live, without thereby thwarting the sensitive, lofty and spiritual aspirations which represent the best part of the individual human being (II, 495);

> Education has an inescapable duty towards man . . . to adapt him to the age in which he lives, without turning him aside from the great and final objective of human life (II, 497);

> To educate is to entrust man with the whole of human experience which has preceded him; it is to make each man a summary of the living world . . . to place him at the level of his times . . . to prepare him for life (II, 507);

> To educate is to give man the keys to the world, which are independence and love, and to give him strength to journey on his own, light of step, a spontaneous and free being (I, 1965).

In the four concepts quoted above we find two ideas central to Martí's concept of education: education is a preparation of man for life, not forgetting his spiritual side; and education is the adaptation of man to his times. This may be interpreted to mean that education represents for each individual the mastery of his autonomy and the development of his natural and spiritual self.

Martí clearly distinguishes education from instruction. The former is concerned with the feelings, while the latter is related to thought. However, he also recognizes that there can be no good education without instruction, since 'moral qualities increase in value when they are enhanced by intellectual qual-

ities' (I, 853). It is this distinction which helps us to understand the importance of education as an attempt to 'entrust man with the whole of human achievement' and to 'make each man a summary of the living world up to his own time'. Education, in the sense of a summing-up, is impossible unless it is accompanied by instruction; but by adapting man to his times and providing him with the capacity for freedom and culture, education fulfils no more than its basic task, namely the cultivation of all the human faculties as a whole.

In Martí's educational theory, none of the concepts summarized above has had greater impact than the idea that education should adapt man to his times. His statement that 'the divorce which exists between the education given during a particular period and the period itself is simply criminal' (II, 507) in fact contains two meanings. One is direct and literal. Martí sees the period as the time in which it is given to us to live in common with all our contemporaries; this reveals the keen historical awareness that permeates all his educational thinking. Each period requires educational institutions and patterns that are suited to it, and this needs to be clearly stated with respect to higher education: 'For the New World we need a New University' (II, 507).

The second meaning conveyed is more figurative and indirect, although as real as the literal meaning; its purport is to project the temporal plane on to the historical one in such a way that they merge into each other. The period is not only a 'time' but also an 'environment'. In an article published in Patria (2 July 1883), Martí says:

> The danger of educating children away from their homeland looms almost as large as the need for the children of ill-fated countries which are still struggling into existence to be educated abroad, where they may acquire the knowledge necessary for the full development of their emerging countries. ... The danger is great, because it is a mistake to grow orange trees and then transplant them to Norway, or to plant apple trees which are expected to bear fruit in Ecuador; a transplanted tree must be able to conserve its native sap so that when it returns to its native soil it may take root (I, 863).

Referring to his reasons for publishing *La edad de oro*, he wrote to his Mexican correspondent, Manuel Mercado:

> The magazine is concerned with serious ideas, and as I have taken this upon myself . . . its aim must be to promote what I seek to promote, which is that our countries should be inhabited by people with original minds, brought up to be happy in the country in which they live and to live in harmony with it, not divorced from it like citizens in name only, or disdainful foreigners who regard their birth in this part of the world as a punishment (II, 1,201).

This is not a xenophobic attitude, since few people have believed as firmly as Martí in solidarity between peoples. Nor is it arbitrary, because the natural development of man is itself conditioned by the atmosphere existing in a particular society, for the reason that 'the purpose of education is not to form an individual who is inexistent, either because he disdains or because he is unable to

adapt to the country in which he has to live; it is to prepare him to live a good and useful life there' (I, 864). This means forming people in accordance with the ideal which Martí proclaims for Latin America: 'people who are good, useful and free' (I, 866).

For Martí this raises three questions. How can you form goodness, except through love? How can people be made free, if they are not allowed to live in freedom? How can they made useful without a scientific knowledge of the forces of nature?

Education as an act of creation

Martí's view of education as an act of love is illustrated throughout his own life and in the ideas he expressed on this subject. In his opinion, the act of education is a specific relationship between human beings nurtured by love. It was this belief which was behind his call for the establishment of a body of 'missionary' teachers who would be able to 'launch a campaign of tenderness and knowledge' (II, 515), a body of itinerant teachers who would engage in dialogue, not pedantic schoolmasters.

Even more specifically, education is a constant act of creation, and for Martí the main creative agent is the teacher. He expressed this poetically when recalling his stay in Guatemala:

> I had come some months before to a beautiful village; when I arrived I was poor, I knew no one and my spirits were low. Without affronting my self-respect or offending my pride, the sincere and generous people of that village gave shelter to me as a humble pilgrim: they made me their teacher, which was the same as making me a creator (II, 205).

Education and the child's development

While this was how Martí saw the act of education from the teacher's viewpoint, he also saw it as a relationship whose opposite pole is the pupil. The four published issues of *La edad de oro* sufficiently indicate his thorough knowledge of the child's mind, but in addition his writings contain a series of ideas on the development of the child and of education. He held that education should not disturb the child's development, and schools should be 'places for the cultivation of reason' where, through judicious guidance, children gradually learn to form their own ideas.

The principle of individuality as a basic factor in education is precisely one of the key ideas in Martí's educational thinking. In effect, he describes individuality as what European educationists at the beginning of the twentieth century were to call the 'regulating element' in education. He argued that 'education is the road, but the child's character and individuality are the motive force' (I, 1960). He thus came to formulate the general concept of self-education that 'education is the use of learning to guide one's own powers' (II, 737); and to view

education in general – the reference to Rousseau is obvious – as 'growth' from within, which begins at birth and ends only with death (II, 1261).

The social and political dimension of education

José Martí also had a clear view of the social dimension of education as both a phenomenon and a process. This he expressed in his ideas on the sociology of education, which in themselves constitute principles for an educational policy.

> Of all the problems which are nowadays considered to be of paramount importance, only one is in fact so. It is of such tremendous importance that all the time and energy in the world would hardly be enough to solve it, namely the ignorance of the classes which have justice on their side (I, 737).

These words provide us with the key to his socio-political thinking on education. While he himself expressed his thoughts in terms of action, love and creativity, nowadays we prefer to express it in more specifically sociological, political and democratic terms.

With this in mind, Martí highlighted one of the ideas which characterized liberal democracy in Latin America during the second half of the nineteenth century, that of 'popular education'. Almost all his socio-educational ideas take this kind of education as their starting-point for the progress of people, though it is defined in extremely wide terms: 'Popular education does not mean only the education of the poorer classes; it means that all the classes of the nation, in other words the people, should be well educated' (I, 853). In addition, such education is the only way of achieving democracy, since, to quote his own words: 'An ignorant man is on the way to becoming an animal, whereas an educated and responsible man is on the way to becoming God; and no one would hesitate between a people of gods and a people of animals' (I, 854). Martí had boundless faith in education as the remedy for the ills of society, especially if its objective was to arouse people to an awareness of their solidarity (II, 510).

Martí's educational policy was never the vain dreams and ideals of a lifelong exile excluded from any role in the government of his country. In his conception of educational policy, he attached overriding importance to the principles of 'national education', 'freedom of education' and 'compulsory education'; though he significantly reversed the order of the last two concepts, giving priority to compulsory education over freedom of education on the grounds that he considered 'the beneficial tyranny of the former to be worth more than the freedom of the latter'.

Science education

In an educated society, which for Martí is the same as 'a free people', people are educated for freedom, in the same way as the good man is formed by love. However, in addition to goodness and freedom, he required people to be useful.

To train them to this end, he proposed science education as paving the way for the development of the intelligence, as an instrument for individual autonomy and the keystone of the progress of peoples.

Martí constantly emphasized the importance of science education, contrasting it with, or distinguishing it from, education which he called 'classical', 'literary', 'formal' or 'ornamental'. In this approach he revealed the influence of Herbert Spencer, though in Martí's case it was broadened by a poetic love of nature. His naturalism was spiritualized, not biological or materialist; it was closer to Rousseau than to Spencer.

Be that as it may, in his view education was not merely formal or rhetorical but based on the study of nature. This promoted social progress, because 'to study the forces of nature and learn to control them is the most direct way of solving social problems' (I, 1076). Science was the only path leading to nature, and it was essential to introduce science education 'wherever new men are to emerge' (I, 1829).

Martí contrasts 'scientific humanism' with 'classical humanism', arguing that education based on the latter is out of date and only offers 'ornament and elegance' (II, 495-96). Commenting on the meeting of the principals of the Massachusetts schools in 1883, he noted that:

> Traditional education, based on Greek poems and Latin books, or on the histories of Livy or Suetonius, is now taking its last stand against a rising new type of education. This is now establishing itself as the legitimate expression of the impatience of men at last set free to learn and to act, who need to know about the creation and movement and progress of the earth which is theirs to cultivate, making it yield by their labours the means of universal well-being and of their own sustenance (II, 496).

To refute the argument in defence of the study of dead languages as providing mental exercise, he asks whether contemplation of 'the admirable and harmonious order of nature would not be more beneficial to the mind than that of the inversion of the normal order of words in a Latin sentence or the comparative study of Greek dialects' (II, 496).

The strange thing is that, in fact, Martí did not regard the study of Greek or Latin as useless; of those who argued that they were totally useless, he said that 'they have savoured the delights of neither Greek nor Latin; neither the books of Homer which seem like the first forests on earth, with their huge trunks, nor the fragrance and delicacy of the epistles by the friend of Maecenas' (II, 496). He nevertheless adduced powerful arguments against classical education. The first was that he wished Latin America to have not merely rhetoricians and aesthetes, but men capable of making the earth yield happiness for its peoples. The second was clearly of a political nature: he considered that these languages helped to form a caste system, and that to continue to teach them alone would be to encourage those who still maintained 'the need to construct a barrier of an exclusive highly educated class against the universal assault of new

and vigorous currents of social thought which are carrying all before them' (II, 593).

This profound belief in science education explains why Martí constantly demanded a radical reform of contemporary education. It also explains his enthusiasm when he visited an engineering school in St Louis (in the United States), and when he wrote down the syllabus of the school of electrical engineering; and when he learnt that Nicaragua, in celebration of an anniversary, was opening an Arts and Vocational Training School on the lines of those already existing in Guatemala, Honduras and Uruguay, and about to be opened in Chile and El Salvador (II, 507-10). It also explains the reforming zeal which he showed in his unflagging support for the establishment of agricultural schools (II, 501) actually located in the countryside; his insistence that each school should have a workshop adjoining it; his belief in the educational value of manual work (I, 1969; II, 510); his reference to the importance of physical education (II, 537); his aim of raising women to be a spiritualizing force in society by means of education (II, 500-01); his keen interest in the methods used in a Mexican school for the deaf and dumb (II, 814); his brief comparison of the old system of education with the new system he dreamt of: 'At school we were beaten into learning by heart; but where we learned most was on the journey there through the snow' (II, 97).

The question arises as to whether Martí's pedagogy was strictly science-based. As regards the origin of his interest in science, we have already said that the importance he attributed to science education arose solely from his desire to make the peoples of Latin America useful and independent. However, the influence of Spencer is undeniable: Martí knew his work, and even left us an outline of his thought (I, 952), ascribing to him a major role in the intellectual liberation of Latin America (II, 101). Nevertheless, he did not accept his system as dogma, and rejected positivism on the grounds that it was 'an immoral negation of being as something improvable and permanent' (II, 1777). Martí's positivism was in any case one which had been filtered through his own creative personality.

Mention has also been made of Martí's pragmatism based on John Dewey's ideas. Saul Flores,[5] who is one of the proponents of this theory, claims that there is no other way of explaining Martí's call for the replacement of 'rote learning in school' by 'practical learning'. However, in Martí's work there is no mention either of Dewey or of his predecessors Pierce and William James. In addition, although Dewey's ideas had already begun to circulate during the period when Martí was in New York (with interruptions, from 1880 to 1895), Martí's first important books (*My Pedagogic Creed and The School and Society*) appeared only in 1897 and 1900.

More to the point is the opinion of Díaz Ortega[6] who maintains that the United States and Europe provided Martí with the foundations of an educational culture which he was able to use to criticize and compare the educational policy of Latin America, while it was Latin America that gave him the setting in which he could see and experience the basic educational problems facing its peoples. In

addition, although there are similarities between Martí and Dewey, it is not going too far to assert that Martí's educational ideas are imbued with a guiding principle reflecting what might be called 'spiritual activism'.[7] Santovenia said that Martí is, above all, 'the man who seeks harmony', and his ability to find harmony and take an overall view is also apparent in his educational approach: starting with what is useful in Latin American terms, it continues via the ideas of nature and freedom until it comes full circle to all that is spiritual in man.

Martí's educational thought encompassed the most advanced ideas of his time. Yet in the context of Latin American history, his thought anticipates the future, since it contains such modern principles as: (a) the use of national education as an instrument for achieving the autonomy of peoples; (b) science education and the critical outlook; (c) the relationship between education and work; and (d) the principle of active pupil participation as the basis of learning. Like other great Latin American educators of the period, with a host of great writers and political leaders, José Martí was a pioneer in education, blazing a trail along which we still have a considerable distance to travel.

Notes

1. This profile was first published in *Prospects*, Vol. 14, No. 2, 1984.
2. In order to avoid making the notes too long, I have added after each quotation from Martí's works, in parentheses, the volume and page number (e.g. I, 807) of his *Obras completas* [Complete Works], Havana, Edición del Centenario, Editorial Lex, 1953, 2 vols.
3. F. Lisazo, *Martí, el místico del deber* [Martí, Spiritual Duty], Buenos Aires, Losada, 1940.
4. Saúl Flores (in 'Martí educador' [The Educator Martí], *Archivo José Martí* (ed. by F. Lisazo, Havana, Ministry of Education), Vol. 6, Nos. 1-4, January-December 1952) writes that it was Ernesto Morales, reviewing *La edad de oro*, who drew attention to Martí's educational theory. Fernández de la Vega ('Martí', *Archivo José Martí*, op. cit., Vol. 4, No. 1, January-April 1943) shares Isidro Méndez's opinion that Martí's ideas make up 'a complete programme of popular education'. However, most of those who have dealt with this subject agree that we know little of Martí as a pedagogue apart from such studies as that by Diego Ortega ('Los valores educacionales en José Martí' [Educational Values in José Martí], *Archivo José Martí*, op. cit., Vol. 5, No. 1, January-June 1950) or the brief articles by Saúl Flores or Cordero Amador ('José Martí, educador' [José Martí, Educator], *Archivo José Martí*, op. cit., Vol. 4, No. 1, January-April 1943), Villalba and Villalba Sotillo ('Martí y la educación fundamental' [Martí and Basic Education], *Archivo José Martí*, op. cit., Vol. 5, No. 3, January-June 1951). There are only scattered references in the various published biographies of Martí, although it is possible that more recent studies exist which we have not been able to consult. It should be clearly understood that we are discussing Martí as a 'theoretician' of education, not Martí the 'educator', a subject that has been more amply dealt with, possibly because more easily accessible.
5. Flores, op. cit.

6. 'Humanismo y amor en José Martí' [Humanism and Love by José Martí], *Archivo José Martí*, op. cit., Vol. 5, January-June 1951.
7. In the early 1980s, an interesting interpretation of Martí's spirituality was put forward by Adalberto Ronda Varona in his article 'La unidad de la teoría y la práctica: rasgo característico de la dialéctica en José Martí' [The Unity of Theory and Practice: Typical Features of José Martí's Dialectic], *Revista cubana de ciencias sociales* (Centro de Estudios Filosóficos de la Academia de Ciencias de Cuba/Universidad de la Habana), No. 1, 1983, pp. 50-64.

Works by José Martí on education

Prepared by Isabel Monal

ANTHOLOGIES

La cuestión agraria y la educación del campesino [The Agricultural Question and Peasant Education]. Havana, Editorial Lex, Biblioteca Popular Martiana, 1940.

Educación [Education]. Havana, Oficina del Historiador de la Ciudad, 1961.

Escritos sobre educación [Writings on Education]. Havana, Editorial de Ciencias Sociales, 1976.

Ideario pedagógico [Educational Ideology]. Havana, Centro de Estudios Martianos, Editorial Pueblo y Educación, 1990. (Selected and introduced by Héctor Almendros.)

José Martí: Precursor de la UNESCO [José Martí: Forerunner of UNESCO]. Havana, Comisión Nacional Cubana de la UNESCO, 1953. (Edited and introduced by Félix Lizaso.)

On Education: Articles on Educational Theory and Pedagogy and Writings for Children from 'The Age of Gold'. New York, Monthly Review Press, 1979. (Edited by E. Randall; introduction and notes by P. Foner.)

JOURNAL ARTICLES

Abono: La sangre es buen abono [Fertilizer: Blood is a Good Fertilizer]. *La América* (New York), 1883. (In *Obras completas*, Vol. 8, Havana, Editorial Nacional de Cuba, 1963-65.)

Aprender en las haciendas [Learning on the Estates]. *La América* (New York), 1883. (In ibid.)

Cartas de Martí [Martí's Letters]. *La Nación* (Buenos Aires), 15 August 1883. (In ibid.)

Cartas de Martí - *Nueva York en otoño* [Martí's Letters - Autumn in New York]. 14 November 1886 (In ibid., Vol. 11.)

Cartas de verano [Summer Letters]. *La Nación* (Buenos Aires), October 1890. (In ibid., Vol. 1).

El colegio de Tomás Estrada Palma en el Central Valley [The School of Tomás Estrada Palma in the Central Valley]. *Patria* (New York), 2 July 1892 (In ibid., vol. 5).

Educación científica [Scientific education]. *La América* (New York), September 1883. (In ibid., Vol. 8.)

Escuela de Artes y Oficios [School of Arts and Crafts]. *La América* (New York), November 1883. (In ibid., Vol. 8.)

Escuela de electricidad [School of Electricity]. *La América* (New York), November 1883. (In ibid.)

Escuela de mecánica [School of Mechanics]. *La América* (New York), September 1883. (In ibid.)

Guatemala. Mexico City, Edición El Siglo XIX, 1978. (In ibid., Vol. 7.)

Peter Cooper. *La Nación* (Buenos Aires), 3 June 1883. (In ibid., Vol. 13.)

El proyecto de instrucción pública [The Public Instruction Project]. *Revista Universal* (Mexico City), 6 October 1875. (In ibid., Vol. 6)

Reforma esencial en el programa de universidades americanas. Estudio de las lenguas vivas. Gradual desentendimiento del estudio de las lenguas muertas [Essential Reforms in the Programme of American Universities. Study of Living Languages. Gradual Phasing Out of the Study of Dead Languages]. *La América* (New York), January 1884. (In ibid., Vol. 8.)

Revolución en la enseñanza [Revolution in Teaching]. *Anuario del Centro de Estudios martianos* (Havana), No. 8, 1985, pp. 14-19.

Works about José Martí's educational ideas

Prepared by Isabel Monal

Acosta Medina, R. Algunas ideas de Martí y la pedagogía revolucionaria de hoy [Some of Martí's Ideas and the Revolutionary Education of Today]. *Estudios sobre José Martí*. Havana, Editorial de Ciencias Sociales, 1975.

Armas Rodríguez, M. de. Raíces históricas de la combinación del estudio con el trabajo [Historial Roots of Combining Study with Work]. *Educación* (Havana), January-March 1985.

Armas, R. de. José Martí: educación para el desarrollo [José Martí: Education for Development]. *Santiago* (Santiago de Cuba), No. 55, 1984.

Beiro Gonzáles, L. Martí y la educación rural [Martí and Rural Education]. *ANAP* (Havana), No. 5, May 1982.

Carbón Sierra, A. Martí y la enseñanza de las lenguas clásicas [Martí and the Teaching of Classical Languages]. In: *Universidad de La Habana* (Havana), No. 219, January-April 1983.

Cosmo Baños, P. José Martí: educador revolucionario [José Martí: Revolutionary Educator]. *Filatelia Cubana* (Havana), January-April 1981.

Chávez Rodríguez, J. A. Martí y la calidad de la educación [Martí and the Quality of Education]. *Educación* (Havana), April-June 1983.

Deschamps Chapeaux, P. José Martí, maestro de obreros [José Martí: The Workers' Teacher]. *Estudios sobre José Martí*. Havana, Editorial de Ciencias Sociales, 1975.

Gallego Alfonso, E. Donde yo encuentro poesía mayor [Where I Find Major Poems]. *Educación* (Havana), April-June 1983.

García Consuegra, M. *Martí y la Escuela Nueva cubana* [Martí and the New Cuban School]. Santa Clara, Colección Martiana, 1945.

García Galló, G. J. José Martí y la educación [José Martí and Education]. *Islas* (Santa Clara), January-April 1972.

García Pers, D. José Martí y las cualidades de la personalidad del educador [José Martí and the Quality of the Educator's Personality]. *Simientes* (Havana), November-December 1983.

González López, N. La escuela y la universidad nuevas de Martí [Martí's New School and University]. In: *Universidad de la Habana* (Havana), No. 225, September-December 1983.

González Negrón, N.; Brito Miralent, M.; Valdés Florat, M. Consideraciones en torno a Martí y a educación americana [Reflections on Martí and Education in the Americas] In: *Universidad de la Habana* (Havana), No. 215, January-April 1983.

Hernández Pardo, H. Raíz martiana de nuestra pedagogía – Concepto revolucionario de la combinación del estudio y el trabajo [Martí's Roots in Our Education: Revolutionary Concepts of the Study/Work Combination]. *Anuario del Centro de Estudios Martianos* (Havana), No. 1, 1978.

Jorge, E. Notas sobre la función de *La Edad de Oro* [Notes on the Purpose of *The Golden Age*]. In: *Estudios sobre José Martí*. Havana, Editorial de Ciencias Sociales, 1975.

Kirk, J. M. Reflections on the Educational Philosophy of José Martí and Its Application in Revolutionary Cuba. *Proceedings of the Rocky Mountain Council on Latin American Studies Conference*. 1978.

Llánez Abeijón, M.; García, M.; Rodríguez Ruíz, M. Algunas condiciones acerca de la esencia, los principios, y los métodos de la educación y la instrucción en la obra martiana [Some Influences Affecting the Essence, the Principles and the Methods of Education and Instruction in Martí's Work]. *Islas* (Santa Clara), May-August 1978.

Marino Plá, F. *Martí y sus ideas educacionales* [Martí and His Educational Ideas]. Havana, 1954.

Martí y la education [Martí and Education]. Havana, 1984.

Masó Vásquez, C. Ideas de Martí sobre las universidades [Martí's Ideas on Universities]. *Revista Mexicana de Sociologia* (Mexico City), May-August 1964.

Olivares Sánchez, E. José Martí acerca de la educación [José Martí on Education]. *Simientes* (Havana), September-October 1978.

Rodríguez, E.; Calero, M. José Martí: revolucionario y educador [José Martí: Revolutionary and Educator]. *Cuadernos de educación* (Havana), No. 56, June 1978.

Silva, J.; Marcos, M.; Díaz, A. Las concepciones martianas sobre la escuela y la educacion [Martí's Ideas on School and Education]. *Santiago* (Santiago de Cuba), October 1973.

MENCIUS

(372–289 B.C.)

Ge Zhengming

Mencius (Mengzi), a thinker and educator of the Warring States period of Chinese history whose influence was extremely important, was a key proponent of Confucianism. All his life he revered Confucius (Kongzi). He is on record as saying 'For as long as humanity has existed, no one has yet equalled Master Kong', and 'My sole ambition is to follow the example of Master Kong'. Mencius developed Confucius' philosophical doctrine, elaborating a system related to the school of thought known as subjective idealism. His theory of the natural goodness (*xingshan*) of human nature is based on the idea that the other cardinal virtues, benevolence (*ren*), righteousness (*yi*), respect for rites (*li*) and wisdom (*zhi*), are innate and should be cultivated by each and every person. The ruling feudal power saw him as the 'Second Sage', and from the end of the Song Dynasty, when the feudal political and economic system was on the decline, the Mencius (his collected writings) was raised to the rank of a 'classic', making it compulsory reading for the imperial civil service examinations or promotion. Mencius was regarded as the only orthodox perpetuator of Confucianism, second only to the 'Supreme Sage' himself, and their two doctrines were combined under the joint designation 'The way of Confucius and Mencius' (*Kong Meng zhi dao*). In the sphere of education, Mencius took up Confucius' ideas and developed them, leaving a priceless legacy to posterity. He occupies an outstanding place in the history of education of ancient China

His life and work as an educator

Mencius, whose first name was Ke, was a native of Zou (a district in Shandong province which still bears the same name), in the land of Lu. He was born in 372 B.C. and died in 289 B.C. at the age of 83. He was descended from Men Sun, a member of the nobility of the Lu kingdom. His father died young and his mother made great sacrifices to educate him, moving house on three occasions to offer her son a more propitious learning environment, and severing the thread on

the shuttle of her loom whenever Mencius neglected his lessons to make him understand the need to persevere.

Mencius dedicated most of his life to teaching. On reaching adulthood, he spent more than twenty years travelling around the various kingdoms with his disciples to spread his political ideals. His reputation was such that 'dozens of chariots and hundreds of people' are said to have followed him. On one occasion, the chariots that escorted him and the dense crowd that thronged in his wake as he travelled from one vassal principality to another were far more magnificent than the processions that accompanied Confucius, and everywhere he was greeted with respect. In the twilight of his life, he returned to his homeland to divide his time between education and writing. 'Transmitting the gifts received from Heaven' was a great joy to him. He is deservedly regarded as one of the great figures of education of his time.

In the last few years of his life, Mencius gathered pupils around him, put down his thoughts in writing and, with the help of Wan Zhang, Gong Sunchou and other disciples, compiled the anthology which bears his name and which relates his conversations with the feudal princes and his replies and arguments on various points of doctrine. As well as setting out Mencius' educational work and ideas, this work conveys a striking picture of the intellectual ferment of the time.

Historical background

As already stated, Mencius' thinking on education took shape and matured during the Warring States period (c. 770–221 B.C.). The periods known in China as the Spring and Autumn and Warring States periods are considered to be times of great transformation, with the transition from slavery to feudalism. Economic and political changes had profound repercussions on ideas, culture and education. Culture ceased to be the preserve of slave-owners, knowledge spread to other sectors of society, an educated class emerged, private schools proliferated and different systems of thought were outlined. This new situation was one in which ideas could be expressed with great freedom. Even though sharp distinctions between the various branches of knowledge were not drawn at the time, it was this period that witnessed the emergence, in embryonic form, of such disciplines as philosophy, economics, political science, law, literature, aesthetics, history, geography, the military arts, the educational sciences, psychology, logic, mathematics, astronomy, agronomy, the manual arts, physics, chemistry, biology, hydrology, engineering technology and medicine. It was a time of extraordinary development in the history of education of ancient China. Great impetus was given to social progress and the foundations of feudal culture and education were laid. It can be said that the whole education system of ancient China came into being and took shape during this period. It was within this society in the throes of great transformation that Mencius' thinking on education was formed and developed.

The purpose of education

Mencius held that the purpose of education was to cultivate good people who knew their station in society. He took up the concept of *ren* (humanity or benevolence) so dear to Confucius, feeling that the unification of China called for virtuous leaders like the sovereigns of former times. He recommended that they govern with benevolence, punish as little as possible, refrain from levying excessively high taxes, and ensure that people were assigned five *mu* of land to live on and 100 *mu* to cultivate and that they 'eat their fill in fat years and do not starve to death in lean years'. Thus would the 'sovereign' obtain the 'Mandate of Heaven'. In order to reign, he must have the support of the people; in order to have the support of the people, he must win their hearts and make them happy. In Mencius' eyes, benevolent government (*renzheng*) and virtuous administration (*dezhi*) went hand in hand, and sound administration itself came second to a good education. He therefore emphasized the fact that, in order to govern with benevolence, it was first necessary to provide a good education, the purpose of a good education being to win hearts.

According to Mencius, the first essential was to make sure that old people lacked neither silk to clothe themselves nor meat to feed themselves, and that the people suffered neither hunger nor cold. Only then would schools be opened and the population educated. Only an education provided in such conditions could be considered sound. As to its purpose, it must be to 'teach sons their duties towards their fathers and younger ones their duties to their elders'. That meant continual reference to the great principles of respect for one's father and mother and obedience to one's elder brothers and superiors, the explanation of these principles being the fundamental aim of education. That was the cornerstone of Mencius' moral philosophy.

During the Spring and Autumn period, 'the degeneration of rites and the decadence of music' had induced Confucius to endeavour to regulate relationships between human beings and to recommend that 'each thing be given its own name and each person their own place', according to the precept: 'Let the prince behave as a prince, the minister as a minister, the father as a father and the son as a son'. Mencius also adopted this line of thinking and elaborated upon it.

Mencius' view of providing the people with enough to eat and to protect them from the cold, and urging them to open schools inculcating unremitting filial piety and love for one's elder brothers was that of a champion of the ethical principles that must govern relationships between father and son, prince and minister, husband and wife, older and younger persons and friends amongst themselves. 'When the people in power understand human relationships and have a sense of decorum, the common people will manifest their devotion', he said. If the ruling class could abide by these principles, the internal contradictions within that class would be attenuated and the patriarchal system would be consolidated. If the common people did likewise, 'crime and disorder' would disappear. In other words, once the upper echelons of society observed the rules

of life in society and the common people lived together on good terms, harmony would naturally reign on earth. The objectives that Mencius assigned to education – inculcating filial piety and respect for one's elders, and teaching people to conduct themselves decently towards others – thus served his political aims. This Confucianist concept of education exerted a profound influence on Chinese feudal society.

The function of education

Mencius believed that education played an important role in social development. Its primary function was to develop the mind and strengthen the cardinal virtues – benevolence, righteousness, respect for rites and wisdom. He held that the human being was naturally good, that virtues were innate and simply needed cultivating. Whosoever cultivated them would become a good man, a sage or even a saint. He who debased himself and failed to cultivate his virtues or lost them could only become a scoundrel, a savage or even a creature indistinguishable from an animal. The original virtues could not be developed unless they were reinforced by the knowledge acquired through education. And yet education as Mencius conceived it was above all a matter of self-cultivation and self-improvement. One should first seek to preserve one's good-heartedness, cultivate one's good inclinations and learn to know oneself, and those who lost their natural goodness should try to recover it. Benevolence (*ren*) was a natural virtue of the human being, and righteousness (*yi*) the path to be followed. Anyone who departed from that way and ceased to progress or, dispossessed of their original goodness, was unable to win it back, was much to be pitied. A man who loses his chickens or his dog will go off in search of them, so why should he not do the same when he loses the sense of goodness? Learning serves no other purpose than to help people to retrieve the qualities they have lost. To Mencius' mind, the function of education was therefore to preserve and develop a person's good inclinations, to restore them to those who had lost them, and to fortify natural virtues.

Mencius advocated self-improvement, 'seeking within oneself', self-examination. Aware as he was, however, of the very real obstacles that might jeopardize the quest for knowledge and wisdom, he did not deny the influence of external factors. He recognized the direct effects of a good or bad harvest on the people's morals. And he was conscious of an environmental influence on learning. He affirmed that everything that surrounds us, everything that makes up our environment, has an effect on our character, our moral qualities and our willpower, but such an influence, however great it may be, is not decisive.

While emphasizing self-improvement, Mencius attached great importance to teaching dispensed by a master. Not only did he derive immense pleasure from 'transmitting the gifts received from Heaven' and had numerous pupils throughout his life, but he repeatedly stressed the merits of objective education and wrote a large number of commentaries on teaching and moral education. He

believed that virtue required fathers and elder sons to see to the education of their sons or younger brothers. Those who behaved badly had to be guided along the right path, and those lacking in talent had to be educated. That was a duty which a good father could not shirk.

The theory of 'natural goodness'

Mencius was part of the intellectual movement known as subjective idealism. He saw the human heart, human nature and 'heaven' as three indissociable elements. His thinking on education is thus derived from his 'doctrine of natural goodness' (*Xingshanlun*). During the Warring States period, socio-economic development and increasing friction between the classes offered a breeding-ground for a variety of intellectual movements and inspired philosophers to speculate on human nature, and on the relationship between human nature and the outside world, in an attempt to resolve the social problems of their times. The question of human nature was thus one of the main bones of contention in discussions between rival schools of thought. Some maintained that human beings were by nature neither good nor bad, others that certain individuals were intrinsically bad or, by nature, equally inclined to good and evil; some held that human beings were naturally evil and others that they were naturally good. Mencius' view was that man was predisposed to good, and if some individuals wandered from the right path and turned to evil, it was because external influences had 'perverted their hearts'. This theory of the natural goodness of human nature was based on feelings, knowledge and rites, which are in fact acquired and not innate. Mencius thus posited the values of feudal society as pre-conditions for all experience. That led him to say: 'the saint is of the same substance as I'; like anyone else, he enjoys tasty dishes, pretty melodies and beautiful colours.

Mencius believed that the living environment of the legendary sovereign Shun differed little from that of the savage living in the mountains. That the sovereign had become a paragon of virtue was due to his determination to improve himself. If the savage remained a savage it was because he lived in a pernicious environment and did not seek to improve himself, with the result that his natural goodness had wasted away. Those who, living in an unpropitious environment, 'had no self-respect and were filled with self-doubt', whose 'words were disrespectful and unjust', who let their natural goodness (*shanduan*) wither away and took a path that led them away from goodness, who breached the rules of correct moral conduct and disrupted the order established by the feudal rulers were pronounced by Mencius to be 'not human beings', to have lost their humanity and become animals. Such was the substance of Mencius' 'doctrine of natural goodness', the theoretical basis for his concept of education.

Mencius' concept of moral education

THE THEORETICAL FOUNDATIONS

Mencius considered that character is something innate in every human being. Nature, heaven (*tian*) and human beings form a whole. The moral categories of 'heaven' are engraved on human nature, the rules that govern heaven are rooted in human morality and the human heart abounds in natural virtues. The 'human heart' and the 'heart of heaven' (*tianxin*) are correlated. Wealth or poverty are conferred on us by heavenly command and beyond our control. What we must do, however, is 'seek within ourselves', trying to develop and bring out the tendencies towards goodness over which we have some control. It is clear that Mencius' ideas on moral education are closely linked with subjective idealism.

THE PRINCIPLES AND CONTENT OF MORAL EDUCATION

Preserving one's natural goodness and controlling one's desires. Mencius thought that the best way of developing one's good tendencies was to resist domination by material desires. Those who have few desires will lose little, if any, of their natural goodness. Conversely, those who are racked with desires may preserve some good traits but only very few. Mencius thus argued against cherishing excessive desires for material things.

Seeking within oneself. Mencius saw this as an important means of moral self-improvement: if I treat someone with love and he remains aloof, I must ask myself whether I am being generous enough; if someone is placed under my authority but does not obey me, I must ask myself if I am acting as wisely as I should; if I show consideration to someone but he does not reciprocate, I must ask myself if I am being sufficiently respectful. In short, whenever my conduct does not produce the expected results, I must seek the reasons for this within myself.

Repenting and mending one's ways. Mencius thought that those who refuse to recognize their material desires and lose the virtue of repentance are liable to commit reprehensible acts. These who act wrongly but are ashamed of themselves can recover their propensity for goodness. One must endeavour to correct any errors one has committed and always take the merits of others as a model, trying to better oneself and join others in seeking goodness.

Seeking to recover lost qualities, preserving the benefits of the 'night air' (yegi). Mencius saw regaining a pure heart as one of the keys to moral self-improvement. It meant controlling one's desires, examining one's conscience, repenting and correcting one's faults. This is what he had in mind when he spoke of preserving the benefits of the 'night air': fortifying one's soul, cultivating one's natural goodness.

Developing the natural nobility of the soul (haoran zhi qi). Human beings must show strength of character and not go about their business half-heartedly and apathetically. They must display energy (*qi*) and not give way to despondency. In moral terms, they must possess the noble-mindedness that makes it possible to combat evil with justice.

Strengthening one's resolve. This concept was crucial to Mencius' idea of moral education. The hardships and misfortunes by which all are confronted in the course of a lifetime are conducive to meditation on the vicissitudes of fate, and this is how one acquires the wisdom (*dehui*) and thirst for knowledge (*giuzhi*) that will enable one to understand the world and improve one's ability to cope with it. The human being must have passed a thousand tests before being truly seasoned.

Teaching methods

Mencius gave a great deal of thought to teaching methods and learned from his own great experience in this field. These are some of his precepts:

Know to whom you are talking and adapt your teaching to each individual's aptitudes, adopting a lively and flexible approach that can be varied, according to the pupil.

Lay down strict criteria and encourage personal initiative, setting the aims and then leaving pupils to practise and learn their lessons by themselves.

Say profound things simply, speak knowledgeably and in great detail, teaching pupils what they do not know on the basis of what they do know. Use simple words to explain complex ideas and make sure that your own knowledge is extensive, so that you are able to give detailed explanations.

Base your arguments on analogy and use comparisons to explain things; illustrate the most complex concepts with common examples taken from everyday life. Mencius himself often used analogy to support his arguments and simple images to clarify obscure points. Likewise, he often used easily understandable comparisons to reply to questions or to solve problems.

With regard to the learning process, Mencius made the following recommendations:

Consolidate the skills you have acquired by individual work, seek a deeper understanding of what you have learned and let it become so deeply rooted in your mind that you have a perfect command of it.

Progress step by step. Mencius regarded learning as a natural process. Progress should be slow but sure, taking care not to advance too quickly only to fall back subsequently.

Work unremittingly. Pupils must persevere and be determined; they must acquire confidence, not losing heart at the first obstacle and above all not taking the easy way out.

Pupils must throw themselves whole-heartedly into their work, devoting to it all their time and energy.

The influence of Confucius

Mencius was 'the pupil of a disciple of Zi Si', whose real name was Kongzi; a grandson of Confucius, he had himself studied under the master's star pupil, Zengzi. Zengzi had passed Confucius' teachings on to Zi Si, whose disciple had in turn passed them on to Mencius. Thus, some 150 years after the death of Confucius, Mencius began to propagate his own ideas. Like him, he cited the ancient sovereigns Yao and Shun as examples and developed the master's theories about the need for virtuous administration (*dezhi*) and benevolent government (*renzheng*), which were, he held, essential in securing the support of the people. He considered that people endowed with wealth and a certain level of income also had to display moral qualities and observe certain rules of conduct, failing which anarchy and disorder would ensue. The idea that the country must be administered honestly, that the population must be educated and, first and foremost, that the common people who were to be educated must not be exposed to either hunger or cold is one of the keys to Mencius' concept of education.

Confucius said: 'He who possesses knowledge at birth is a superior being.' Only the saint, he thought, possessed inborn knowledge, which was why he urged the acquisition of knowledge through study. Mencius, for his part, believed that everyone on earth was intuitively endowed with a sense of what is good and he therefore saw all human beings as possessing inborn knowledge. That is why he urged them rather to 'seek within themselves'.

From as early as the Spring and Autumn period of Chinese history, Confucius set about regulating social relations by advocating that 'each thing should be given its own name' and each person 'his own place'. In the Warring States period, Mencius took up this idea and elaborated upon it, urging educators to understand and respect the moral principles that must govern feudal society and relations between nobles and serfs, rich and poor, men and women, young people and old, and friends among themselves. In other words, Mencius' 'accomplishing one's duty at the risk of one's life' (*shesheng guyi*) echoed Confucius' 'sacrificing one's life through humanity' (*shashen chengren*).

When Mencius recommended that teaching methods should vary according to the different categories of pupils, he was also drawing upon Confucius' precept that teaching should be tailored to the aptitudes of each pupil. Where Mencius advised people to correct their mistakes and mend their ways, Confucius had already said: 'Anyone who has committed a fault must not be afraid to correct it.' It is thus clear that Confucius played an important part in the formation of Mencius' views on education. These ideas all exerted a considerable influence in the sphere of moral education.

Mencius' role and influence

Mencius was a great educator of the Warring States period, and his influence was extremely important. His thinking, like that of Confucius, had a fairly substantial impact outside China, and his position in the history of education in ancient China itself is outstanding. Some aspects of his work still influence the teaching methods used in China today, and some of his educational principles continue to inspire us. For two millennia, his appeal to 'cultivate the nobility of the soul' has met with an extraordinary response, giving many people the courage to be true to their convictions or even to sacrifice themselves for them. His advice that people should strengthen themselves by putting themselves to the test and should make good use of their talents is also extremely useful. Many people of goodwill, ardent patriots with the interests of the people at heart, have been inspired by his call to 'accomplish one's duty, at the risk of one's life'. He advocated a number of extremely sound educational approaches, such as setting strict criteria and encouraging personal initiative, which bore fruit in the rigorous standards of Chinese education after him. He excelled at expressing abstract, complex ideas clearly, in just a few words, using vivid, precise metaphors. His advice was to put one's whole heart and determination into one's study and to devote all one's attention to it. This scientific principle that Mencius drew from his practical experience of teaching 2,000 years ago is still observed to this day. When he said that teachers should love their work, take good care of their pupils, and set them an example, possess a vast store of knowledge and add to it constantly, he was stating precepts that have made a major contribution to the Chinese nation's efforts in the field of education.

His recommendations to students – to consolidate what one has learned through individual study, aim to make steady progress, work without respite and put one's whole heart into one's study – together with his advice to teachers – to adapt teaching to suit each person's aptitudes, set strict criteria, encourage personal initiative, express profound ideas in simple terms, and explain with the help of comparisons – combine to form a coherent system. This approach to teaching continues to exercise a profound influence in China and is still relevant today.

Just as Confucius is being rediscovered and his work subjected to fresh critical appraisal, so Chinese educators are continuing to sound the depths of Mencius' doctrine. Many positive elements of his educational theory have found practical application in the classroom, even though historical circumstances have changed beyond recognition. The educational tradition of which Confucius and Mencius are the two great pillars is thus being perpetuated in China and in the rest of eastern Asia, with discernment and along new lines, as part of the modernization process now under way.

Bibliography

Gudai jiaoyu sixiang luncong [Collection of Texts on Theories of Education in Antiquity]. Beijing shifan daxue chubanshe, 1985. 2 v.

Mao Lirui; Chen Guanqun, (eds.). *Zhongguo jiaoyu tongshi* [General History of Education in China]. Shandong jiaoyu chubanshe, 1986. 2 v.

Yang Huanying. *Confucius sixiang zai guowai de chuanbo yu yingxiang* [Dissemination and Influence Abroad of Confucius' Thinking]. Beijing, Jiaoyu kexue chubanshe, 1985.

Zhang Rui et al., (eds.). *Zhongguo gudai jiaoyu shi ziliao* [Materials for a History of Education in Ancient China]. Renmin jiaoyu chubanshe, 1980.

Zhongguo jiaoyu shi jianbian [Concise History of Education in China]. Beijing, Jiaoyu kexue chubanshe, 1984.

Zhongguo gudai jiaoyujia yinyu [Factors for a Study of Educators in Ancient China]. Anhui jiaoyu chubanshe, 1983.

Zhongguo gudai jiaoyu wenxuan [Selected Texts on Education in Ancient China]. Renmin jiaoyu chubanshe, 1986.

Zhou Dechang. *Zhongguo gudai jiaoyu sixiang de pipan jicheng* [Drawing with Discernment on the Educational Theories of Ancient China]. Beijing, Jiaoyu kexue chubanshe, 1982.

MISKAWAYH

(A.D. 932–1030/A.H. 320–421)

Nadia Gamāl al-Dīn

The tenth century A.D. (fourth century A.H.) is regarded as one of the most brilliant periods of Islamic civilization; during this time Muslims reached the peak of their intellectual maturity and progress in ideas. Indeed, a number of historians have seen it as the 'Golden Age' of this outstanding civilization.[1] It was in this century that Abu 'Ali Ahmad b. Muhammad b. Ya'qub Miskawayh (also known as Ibn Miskawayh) was born. It is now established that his name was actually Miskawayh, yet we find a number of his works, especially those not written by but in fact attributed to him, where the name on the cover is Ibn Miskawayh. Those few works which are actually written by him bear the correct name, Miskawayh; and that is how he is referred to by his contemporaries and the intellectuals and writers who worked with him.[2]

Miskawayh lived in the fourth century A.H., yet his very productive life extended for around twenty years into the fifth century, as is indicated by the date of his death. So he spent the whole of his life within the period of the Abbasid Empire, the rule of which extended from A.D. 750 to 1258 (A.H. 132 to 656).

This period is well known as a time when Muslim intellectuals were concentrating on translating the sciences from other languages, and it also stimulated a flourish of writing in Arabic, once the translation process had yielded its results. Many Muslims excelled in the branches of learning known at that time. As a result of the many books translated into Arabic, the various enterprises in different fields, and the spread of the use of paper, the caliphs turned their attention to the establishment of what were known as *Dar al-'ilm* or *Dar al-hikma* (Houses of Learning or of Wisdom) in Baghdad, Cairo, Córdoba and in other places in the Islamic world. These operated somewhat like public libraries, since they were well provided to satisfy the needs of general readers and specialists. Stationers' shops also appeared selling books or renting them out to readers; and there was increased competition among the caliphs, viziers, learned men and others to acquire books and to establish their own private libraries in their resi-

dencies. They gathered people together for learned discussions on the content of these books, in what today might resemble seminars or study circles.

Miskawayh himself worked as a librarian for the collections of a number of viziers (ministers) of the Buwayhids during the Abbasid rule. This work must have brought him into contact with the culture of his age, so varied in its sources and types, such that he was able to learn for himself and to make a thorough study of various branches of science and human knowledge.

Although Miskawayh was born to Muslim parents in Rayy, in Persia, he travelled to Baghdad, where he studied and worked, and was well known there for a time. Then he returned to live in Isfahan, in Persia, for a period of time and it was here that he died and was buried – according to the most reliable account – after a life of nearly 100 years.

Miskawayh is one of the outstanding personalities in the history of philosophical thought among the Muslims. His fame did not come about as a result of his involvement with teaching or with writing on education, but arose uniquely from his work in philosophy.

Miskawayh was attracted to Greek philosophy, the books of which were then available in a variety of Arabic translations. However, he did not stop at logic and theology, as did preceding Muslim philosophers such as al-Fārābī, considered among Muslims as the 'Second Teacher' after Aristotle, the 'First Teacher'. Rather, he concentrated on dealing with matters neglected by most of his predecessors or contemporaries among the philosophers. He differed from them in his concern for ethics more than most other studies of traditional philosophy at that time. Hence he was named by some the 'Third Teacher', since he was considered the first ethical thinker among the Muslims.[3]

If Miskawayh was most famous in the field of ethics, like others among the foremost Muslim intellectuals he was very much attracted to the philosophy of the famous Greeks such as Plato and Aristotle, whose books, translated into Arabic, exerted their special fascination on those who were devoted to philosophy.[4]

Perhaps the influence of Plato and Aristotle on Miskawayh is shown most clearly in his book *Tahdhib al-akhlaq wa-tathir al-a'raq* [Refinement of Character and Purification of Dispositions]. He did not confine himself to the works of the most well-known Greek philosophers, but studied others and referred to them also in his various works. These included Porphyrius, Pythagoras, Galen, Alexander of Aphrodisias and particularly Bryson. From the latter, Miskawayh took most of what he wrote in connection with the education of young boys, although Bryson was not well known, as will be discussed later.[5]

Miskawayh is very clearly distinguished from others who worked in science and philosophy within Islamic civilization by the fact that he indicated clearly and distinctly the sources on which he drew; something which proves his scientific reliability and also emphasizes his patent admiration for the branches of learning which he studied, which were well known and widespread throughout

the Islamic community. He had no hesitation in rewriting them in his own language, Arabic.

Just as he was influenced by the Greek philosophers, so he was by his predecessors and contemporaries among the Muslim philosophers and scholars. Some of them he referred to specifically in his writings, such as al-Kindī or al-Fārābī, while with others he was content merely to mention their ideas.

Perhaps one of the most important conclusions to be drawn from Miskawayh acknowledging his great admiration for the Greek philosophy he was familiar with is that he did not aim for a reconciliation between religion and philosophy, as other previous Muslim philosophers had done. Nor did he attempt to combine them, as was done by the Brethren of Purity, for example; but the opinions he set forth remained Greek in nature, and were usually attributed to their original exponents.[6]

Miskawayh's scientific output was not restricted precisely to the field of philosophy and ethics. He made a distinguished contribution to history; he also busied himself with chemistry, and was concerned with literature and other subjects. This emphasizes the multiple facets of his culture, making him a mirror for his age. He is distinguished by the many sources of his culture and the encyclopedic nature of his writings.[7]

Miskawayh said himself in his book *Tahdhib al-akhlaq* [Treatise on Ethics] for example, that it is a book composed 'for the lovers of philosophy in particular, and it is not for the general public'.[8] This indicates how much he was influenced by the culture coming to the Islamic nation. It may also be that it distanced him to some extent from the Islamic tendency, which did not recognize particularity in the field of learning, because the specialization of the élite in rational sciences was merely a Greek idea, as is well known.

Ethics and education

Tahdhib al-akhlaq is considered Miskawayh's most famous book. We shall examine its contents at some length in order to present Miskawayh's remarks on the education of young boys. The work contains, in general, the majority of ideas which he introduced in this subject, although he also intended to acquaint the reader with the way to reach supreme happiness. Maybe this tendency of his can be considered an effective translation, or a practical application, of the views he embraced, such as 'seeing comes before action',[9] i.e. knowledge precedes action. If the reader is familiar with moral happiness, and is influenced by the contents of the book, all subsequent actions will be admirable, according to this view. Hence it can be proposed that Miskawayh's book prepares the way to reach supreme happiness for anyone examining its contents. It is not possible to separate the learners' personality and character from the science they are learning, and the purpose for which they are striving to learn it.[10]

The second *maqala* (section) of the seven in the book discusses character, humanity and the method of training young men and boys. This is preceded in

the first *maqala* by a discussion of the soul and its virtues. These two sections amount to a general introduction necessary because of the prevailing opinion in Miskawayh's day when psychological studies took precedence over any other philosophical subject. There was an obligatory introduction to every philosophical study.

'Moral happiness' was the state enabling the human being to live happily, in accordance with the requirements of virtue. Thus it was personal happiness that human beings could reach through intellectual effort, striving to acquire the sciences which would make their thoughts inclusive of all areas and existing beings, and make them free from material desires so as to reach the degree of wisdom enabling them to grasp human perfection. The knowledgeable one who reaches this degree of supreme happiness was, in Miskawayh's opinion, 'the completely happy one', and the pleasure attained was an intellectual pleasure.[11]

Miskawayh mentioned supreme happiness in the third *maqala* of *Tahdhib al-akhlaq*, and gave a detailed account of it in order to attract the attention of those who were unaware of it so that they would be motivated by the desire to reach it.[12]

After this, Miskawayh set out to clarify the various kinds of happiness and their virtues. He cited a number of conditions for their realization, some internal and some external. Among the internal conditions influencing the rational state of human beings and their moral direction towards good or bad are the state of their own bodies, in other words the enjoyment of good health and a moderate temperament. Other conditions are external to the human body and help people to rise above shortcomings, and to appreciate good in others, including friends, children and wealth. Love of others and affection towards them can play a part in the progress and upward movement of all people. It is the sphere for fulfilling the different virtues. In addition, there is the surrounding environment, inasmuch as human society is one of the basic conditions for reaching supreme happiness. Human beings can only achieve perfection if it is affirmed through social life.

As a result of living together and being in contact with each other, human beings' experience is enriched and virtues are rooted in their soul simply by putting these virtues into practice.

The importance of transactions with other people, as Miskawayh said, relates to the fact that certain virtues are only evident in the company of and in dealings and interaction with others, such as integrity, courage and generosity. If a person did not live in this human milieu, these virtues would not be apparent, and the individual would be like a frozen or dead person. Miskawayh repeats in several places that this is the reason why wise men have stated that human beings are social by nature, meaning that they need a community containing many people to achieve complete happiness. This being so, it is easy to refer the idea back to its original source, since Aristotle presented it in *Nicomachean Ethics*.[13]

Beyond all this, the basic conditions for achieving happiness are psychological; this is because training the soul, purifying it, teaching it, making it profit from general and particular experiences, are all centred on people's will and their

ability to raise their inclinations, so as to attain the degree of happiness appropriate for them.

The sixth *maqala*, entitled 'Medicine for Souls', clarifies the need for human beings to be aware of their own defects. The seventh, entitled 'Restoring Health to the Soul', clarifies the method of treating sickness of the soul. In this *maqala*, Miskawayh does not distinguish between evil and sickness. He lists: rashness, cowardice, pride, boasting, frivolity, arrogance, scorn, treachery, accepting injustice and fear. Miskawayh was concerned with fear of death, also grief. He considered that it is not difficult for the rational person who desires to free the soul from its pains and save it from danger to examine these shortcomings and treat them so as to be set free from them. This must be by God-given success and by personal striving; both are required, one complementing the other.[14]

This may serve to explain that, for Miskawayh, ethics were very closely bound up with the objective of the individual's education. He continually stressed that it is not possible to distinguish between the learner's personality and character, on the one hand, and, on the other, the science one learns and the aim and objective for which one is striving to learn it. This is what he stressed very clearly in the introduction to his book:

> Our aim in this book is that we should acquire for our souls a character, whereby we shall give rise to deeds which are all fine and good, yet will be easy for us, with no trouble or hardship. This will be by craft and educational organization, and the way here is that we should firstly know our own souls, what they are, and what kind of thing they are, and for what reason they were created within us – I mean, their perfection and their aim – and what are their faculties and abilities, which, if we use them as is needful, will bring us to this high rank; and what are the things holding us back from it, and what will purify them so they prosper, and what will come upon them so that they fail.[15]

As a philosophical study, ethics is considered a practical philosophy, which strives to decide what should be; it does not lead to philosophical reflection as a final aim, but rather is used in practical life. Miskawayh himself emphasized this by looking at philosophy and its divisions, for he saw that it is divided into two parts: a theoretical part and a practical part, each complementing the other.[16]

It should be pointed out here that when Miskawayh set out to address the training of young boys, he only approached this subject as a part of his serious intellectual concern with the final objective to which the individual is heading, or should be heading; his moral philosophy, as a whole, prevails upon the human being to achieve supreme happiness, for there is no paradise or hell, no reward or punishment, since he distinguishes, with deference, between philosophy and religion. He considers that religion retains human beings in a state of childhood and adolescence, where the faculty of the intellect is weak, while philosophy and supreme happiness bring them to youth and manhood, where the intellect is mature and they know how to employ it to reach the highest virtues and most perfect aims.[17]

The foregoing clarifies, to a great extent, how Miskawayh remained one of the Muslim thinkers most devoted to Greek philosophy, for he distinguished between reason and faith, or between philosophy and religion. Supreme happiness is a human happiness, one which is neither imposed nor withheld by anything outside the scope of people's will, and issuing from an intellect greater and stronger than their own.[18]

Miskawayh's discussion of the training of young men and boys is placed within this framework, and his viewpoint on the matter of training must be understood according to the age-group he is addressing.

The training of young men and boys

In his writings, Miskawayh did not use the word 'education' (*tarbiya*) since it was not a word widely used in his day with the technical meaning it has today. It should also be borne in mind that the word 'education' was only quite recently acquired its modern meaning in European languages. The tendency here has been to use the very same word which Miskawayh used in his writings, 'training' (*ta'dib*) so as not to impose on it more significance than was actually intended, and in order to present his thoughts in connection with this important human process without encroaching on his meaning.[19] The opinion here is that reading the text in accordance with the language of his age, and the meanings which the writer himself intended to express, is more precise and respects scientific integrity.

It is also useful to point out that the word 'teaching' (*ta'lim*) was the word in widest circulation and most used in Islamic civilization to express what we mean today by many aspects of the word 'education'. So the words 'teaching' and 'learning' (*ta'allum*) are also very close to words like 'training' and 'culture' (*adab*), where they express the meaning intended. Their use was widespread also in the third and fourth centuries of the Hegira, as was the word 'education'. Some consider that the Koran's use of them restricts them to what today we would call the period of early childhood. This can be attested by reference to the Koranic words, for instance: 'Say, Lord, have mercy on them, as they nurtured (*rabba*) me when young' (17:24). This being so, education indicates a task of an obligatory nature, which is undertaken by adults, particularly parents, for the benefit of the young.[20] If so, it can be said that the meaning of training primarily indicates the effort expended and directed by adults to impart to the young desirable knowledge, morality, customs and behaviour, to prepare them in the manner that makes them the acceptable human model within their society, namely, the Muslim community of that time.

Miskawayh also intended to discuss 'refinement of character' and the way of realizing this. His reflections were based on what was said by Aristotle in his *Ethics*, as well as in his *Discourses*: evil may be transmitted through training, even to the best people, but not in all circumstances. He saw that repeated warnings, training and the adoption of good and virtuous policies must have some

sort of influence among different kinds of people; there are some who accept training and rapidly acquire virtue, and others who approach it slowly.[21]

Miskawayh ended this discussion by explaining his view that every person can be changed; he indicated this possiblity with young men and boys, and, indeed, the necessity of training them. Miskawayh did not confine himself to Aristotle's view, but deduces it also from the reliable laws which are the way God deals with His creation.[22]

So Miskawayh held that what boys have been accustomed to since childhood will influence them when they grow up; hence, he resorted to discussing the training of young boys, to which subject he devoted some pages of his book. He made use of one of the well-known books easily available in the academic environment of the day, and indicated it without ambiguity. Thus in the second *maqala* of *Tahdhib al-akhlaq* there is very clearly the following heading: 'Section on Training Young Men and Boys; Ideas Taken from the Book of Brusun' (i.e. Bryson).

Certain orientalists came across some copies of this book, including a copy in the Egyptian National Library bearing the title *Kitāb Brisis fī tadbīr al-rajul li-manzilihi* [The Book of Brisis on Domestic Economy]. However, the name was also written on an inside page of the book as 'Brusun': which the German Orientalist Paul Kraus identified as Bryson.[23]

Whatever the opinion, this book or manuscript turned Miskawayh's attention to dealing with methods of domestic economy through the discussion of four points: money, servants, women and children.

Miskawayh borrowed from this Greek author only what he had to say about children, in order to emphasize what he himself had already indicated, and in many places it is almost a literal transmission. However, he sometimes added certain personal experiences and observations from his own life.[24] It is useful to extract from this discussion some detail on the aims of training.

The aims of training young boys

Miskawayh trusted in the possibility of refining and purifying morals from the evils and wickedness they had acquired. To this end we see him determining 'that the art of character formation, which is concerned with the betterment of the actions of the individual as human, is the most excellent of the arts'.[25]

This trust was emphasized by the fact that in many places in his book he considered that his remarks about young boys were equally applicable to adults.[26] It is not easy for adults to change the character with which they have grown up and been nurtured – except under special circumstances; unless, indeed, they themselves grasp the extent to which their morals are corrupt, and undertake to change them.

This sort of person it is hoped will abstain from (evil) morals gradually and have recourse to the exemplary way by repentance and by following the example of the good and the wise through the pursuit of philosophy.[27]

The reason behind his emphasis on the possibility of refining character and purifying souls, and freeing the self from evil habits and the like, stemmed from his opinion that people are either good by nature or good by reason of law and learning.[28] Despite this, people differ in receptivity to training and their degree of virtuous morality and admirable behaviour.[29] They do not all belong to one single rank and, if they differ, then this difference and disparity between them, which is broad beyond reckoning, merits the greatest attention with regard to the training and accustoming of young men to approved activities. Neglect of training will cause all human beings to remain the way they were during childhood. Put another way, Miskawayh considered human beings to be in constant need of adapting the way they were brought up and had become accustomed to during childhood, and also what suits them naturally. If they do not do this, they will become wretched, and their link with God is severed. This wretchedness will be confirmed if they do not rid themselves of four characteristics: (a) laziness, idleness and wasting their lives without work, with no human benefit; (b) stupidity and ignorance, caused by failure to be curious and acquaint the soul with the teachings spoken by wise men; (c) insolence, which results from neglect of the soul when it unrestrainedly pursues desires and seeks to commit sins and evil deeds; and (d) preoccupations which arise from persistence in ugly deeds.[30]

For each one of these kinds of wretchedness or delinquency there is a treatment with which intelligent people can heal themselves, if they attempt to do so. The manners mentioned by Miskawayh to train young men and boys can bring about benefits which reflect on the person so trained.

From another angle, training (or education) can be regarded as realizing specified aims, either from the viewpoint of the one who assumes responsibility for it, or of the one subjected to it. To clarify this, we can present Miskawayh's own explanations and extract from them the aims which can be directed to the business of training. Miskawayh said:

> These good manners, which are useful to boys, are likewise useful to older people; but they are more useful to the young, because they accustom them to the love of virtues so that they grow up accordingly. Then it is not hard for them to avoid evil, and later it is easy for them to follow all the prescriptions of wisdom and the regulations of the law [*shari'a*] and tradition [*sunna*]. They become accustomed to keeping themselves away from the temptations of wicked pleasures; they refrain from indulging in any of those pleasures or thinking too much about them. They make them desire the high rank of philosophy and promote them to the high matters described at the beginning of this work, such as seeking proximity to God the Most High, and being near to the angels. They will also be favoured in this world, with a pleasant life and a fine reputation. Their enemies will be few, many will praise them and seek their friendship, especially the virtuous.[31]

From this text, which is repeated in various forms in the *Tahdhib*, we can deduce that Miskawayh had more than one aim for refining and training. Indeed, it can be said that these aims include some which are temporal, for this earthly life, and

some which are concerned with the hereafter, with the eternal. Each is interconnected.

That which is connected with training, avoidance of evils and exercise of the soul, and following what has been defined by law and tradition, and what wisdom prescribes: all these together lead to a praiseworthy and pleasant life, and a fine reputation; this is confirmed by what actually happens insamuch as people will have few enemies and many who praise them and seek their friendship and company. Thus, the practical aim attached to this earthly life, and resulting from the refinement of character, enables human beings to adapt to those around them: and this is exemplified by their conduct and relationships. They must conform to this, continue in it, in true knowledge and action: 'sufficiency lies not in the knowledge of virtues, but in acting with them', as Miskawayh continually stated.[32] When human beings really act in accordance with their knowledge, this is evidence that they have joined the ranks of the wise, or what can be described as the highest point of perfection in humanity.[33] Personal effort in seeking knowledge, and in work and conduct, leads a person to be 'the happy one, the perfect one, seeking to come close to God the Most High, the loving one, the obedient one, and worthy of His friendship and love'.[34]

In Miskawayh's opinion, shared with Aristotle, God is 'the Wise, the Happy, the Perfect in wisdom; He is loved only by the happy and the wise, for a being is only happy with its like'. Hence, whosoever approaches God and earnestly seeks His favour, 'God loves him and brings him close to Him, and he will be worthy of His friendship'.[35] Whosoever approaches God, and God brings him close, becomes in this way supremely happy with a happiness that cannot be surpassed.[36]

Such fulfilment and striving to purify one's character are the final aim of people's journey through life, the conclusion of their work and their service here. Miskawayh prescribed and presented this view to others who desired his knowledge, in the hope that it would help them to achieve it.

By this definition of the final aim, there must perforce be the means of achieving it; consequently, leading questions can be put concerning the method of bringing individuals up in a way that helps them to achieve this aim. Following on what Miskawayh said, the reply requires concern for the training and refining of souls; thence it is possible to begin by becoming acquainted with the souls of young men and boys, and the factors influencing them, or what we could call in today's language 'human nature and the factors influencing its formation'.

Humanity in general, Miskawayh considered, comprises the noblest of all existing beings on the earth which we inhabit.[37] The soul of the boy is ready to receive virtue, because it is 'simple, not yet impressed with any form, nor has it any opinion nor determination turning it from one thing to another'.[38] Because the soul of the boy is ready to accept training, there must be concern for him. He must be cared for and not abandoned to someone who cannot carry out this training well or who does not have an admirable character and excellent habits. Miskawayh remarked that these opinions are taken from Aristotle, but he then

turned in another direction to present the boy's soul and its faculties in a way that agrees with what Plato had earlier said in *The Republic*: the soul is divided into three faculties – the appetitive, the irascible and the rational. These faculties appear gradually, as the boy grows, until he reaches perfection and is then called rational. Diffidence is the sign of this intelligence, the indication that the boy has reached the stage of discernment and, consequently, training, since diffidence means fear of doing anything unseemly.[39]

Miskawayh presented the means or the way by which it is possible to recognize or deduce when the boy has reached this stage: by careful observation of the boy, his intelligence can be deduced. Lowered eyes without staring, no insolent expression on his face: these are among the signs of his nobility and his fear of doing anything unseemly, and his preference for good and for attaining reason. His soul is then ready for training, fit to be taken care of, and must not be neglected. Miskawayh's experience in this field, together with Greek culture, is his guide and the source of his ideas.

The social environment in which the boy grows up plays an obvious role in the formation of the boy's soul, or what can be called the business of bringing him up. That is because the boy's soul is simple, as yet without imprint, and is ready and receptive to training, fit to be taken care of; if the boy finds himself in a bad social milieu, he may be influenced by those around him and consequently corrupted: the soul accepts what it grows up with and is accustomed to, and from this results the concern to watch over young men, and particularly boys.[40] The basic responsibility for this falls upon the parents.[41]

In the boy's early life, Miskawayh remarked, there is a temptation to adopt bad behaviour, such as telling tales about things that he has neither heard nor seen and passing on falsehoods. He may even be tempted by other people's possessions, transmit rumours that he hears and be over-inquisitive. Because of these dangers, there must be a concern for training and refinement during childhood, for children are usually more open to learning and training. Their character is evident in them from the very earliest stage, and they can neither hide nor dissimulate it as can adults who have developed to the point where they know their own defects and so conceal them by carrying out actions that are in fact foreign to their nature. This being so, it is easy to recognize evil character among young men and boys and to work to set them free from it, making them familiar with virtuous morals, since they are capable of adapting to them rapidly.[42]

Starting from these viewpoints, Miskawayh presents the means and methods that can be followed in training and refining the boy's soul. Some of these means are abstract, seeking to influence the boy's soul, and some are connected with his conduct and his external appearance.

Training methods

METHODS OF TRAINING THE SOUL

The psychological aspect is the most important, so Miskawayh began with mentioning a number of abstract methods; to start with, he gives a number of positive aspects.

He considered praise as one of the most important of these means and methods: that is, praising the boy for the good things he does which are acceptable to adults; adults who do good deeds should also be praised in his presence. All this emphasizes fine actions, whether performed by the child or by adults, and by those who are considered as a good example.

It is important to rise above the desire for food and drink and fine clothing. Encouragement means commending abstinence from these things and contentment with only the amount necessary.

The boy should be trained to admire generous characteristics in others, such as offering food and drink to others before oneself, and restraining one's appetite to what is moderate.

He should be warned of punishment, and made to fear being blamed for any evil deed he may commit. If intimidation is employed, this must be by degrees, for if the boy transgresses in any matter which has been mentioned to him or forgets the correct behaviour, then it is best, in this case, to pretend not to have noticed, especially if he himself realizes the error and tries to conceal it and hide it from others.

If it is necessary to reproach the boy for what he has done, so as to avoid his doing it again, this should be done discreetly; alternatively, if these matters were disclosed in public it might lead the boy to be impudent, so that he would think little of being reprimanded, and consequently might continue to indulge in detestable pleasures to which his nature incites him. These pleasures are numerous.[43]

The educator can have recourse to physical punishment if the preceding psychological methods are not successful, and if it is really justified.[44]

MANNERS LINKED TO CONDUCT

These rules of conduct are connected either with sensory pleasures such as food and drink, or with the external appearance such as clothes, or with relaxation from the weariness of study. However, there are also rules such as play and physical exercise, as well as those linked to the child's conduct and his relationships with others.

Rules of food and drink

The boy must understand the basic aim in taking food: it is a necessity for the health of the body and not a means of sensory pleasure. Miskawayh looks on it

as medicinal for the body, to remedy the pangs of hunger and to guard against illness.

Since food is desired neither for its own sake, nor for sensory pleasure, Miskawayh presents a series of recommendations which can be said to be more appropriate for the life led by an ascetic Sufi novice than for a boy in his prime, and at a fundamental stage in his growth. In Miskawayh's view, the educator is meant to make the boy despise the idea of food, and should reduce its amount and its variety; he should restrict himself to one kind when he is eating, and should sometimes eat dry bread on its own. Miskawayh considered that if these habits are commendable for the poor, it is even better that the rich should adopt them. It should be rare to eat meat in the diet, and indeed it is better to go without it most of the time, at the same time as abstaining from sweets and fruit. The main meal is best taken at suppertime, so that it will not lead a person to sleep during the day, for this is not approved.

Eating has its manners which must be watched over, and here Miskawayh advises the boy not to hurry over his food, but rather to chew it well. He should not let his glance dwell for long on the food and the people eating, nor watch what they do with their hands, and he should not wipe his hands on his clothing.

The boy must not drink during the meal, and must beware of wine and any kinds of intoxicating drinks, for these are harmful to both body and soul. Furthermore, the boy must avoid attending any drinking sessions, so that he will not hear the follies which go the rounds at such times, unless they are attended by well-bred, virtuous people, from whose conversation and knowledge he can profit. Here, it is noticeable that Miskawayh did not say that wine is forbidden, as is clearly laid down in Islamic religion; in his view, the prohibition does not so much stem from the rulings of Islamic religion as from an exemplary view of how the virtuous person should behave, and the moral code to which the boy must be trained and accustomed.

Rules of etiquette for clothing

Miskawayh explained that the boy must grow up in the accepted way for people of nobility and honour; he should wear white clothing, and avoid coloured or patterned materials, since these are more appropriate for women and slaves. This has to be repeated in the boy's ears many times, so that he may be brought up, or grow up, in this way. The boy should not adorn himself with what women would wear, nor wear a signet-ring except when it is necessary to do so, nor let his hair grow long. This counsel is also extended to not taking pride in the father's possessions, whether food or clothing or anything else. Love of gold and silver is a catastrophe, and the boy must be advised to avoid them and not resort to them in any shape or form.[45]

Rules for physical exercise and play

It is a duty to care for the body, since it will bring benefits to the boy. There are rules of etiquette to be learned and followed; we conclude that Miskawayh is

concerned with physical exercise. Despite the importance of this exercise for the body, Miskawayh did not neglect the psychological effect of play, and hence he includes some features of it which should be present.

Miskawayh advises giving the boy an opportunity to play at certain times, although this play must be of a suitable kind, enabling him to relax from the weariness of learning and observing etiquette; however, there should be nothing in this play to cause the boy pain or distress.[46]

Physical exercise is important to the body, since the boy must be accustomed to walk, to move and to ride, so that he does not become lazy; various kinds of exercise dispel dullness, stimulate energy and purify the soul.[47]

In this connection, Miskawayh warned against sleeping for too long, for this causes laziness, dulls the mind and deadens the thoughts. He stated that the boy must be prevented from sleeping at all during the day.[48]

General rules of conduct

Miskawayh sets forth a number of rules of etiquette (*ādāb*) connected with the external appearance and the general image of the virtuous person in society to which the boy must be brought up and accustomed. He must not spit, blow his nose or yawn in the presence of others; he must not cross his legs, put his hand beneath his beard nor support his head between his hands, because these are signs of laziness.

Concerning ethical aspects, Miskawayh mentioned other rules of etiquette to which the boy must become accustomed, a kind of personal code of morals related to his dealings with others: for example, never swear, whether in justification of truth or falsehood, for that is disgraceful for men, though it may sometimes be felt necessary. In addition to not swearing, the boy must be accustomed to speaking as little as possible, and only in reply to questions. He must become used to listening to those older than himself, and keeping silence before them; he must be prevented from saying anything evil, and from uttering insults, curses or indulging in foolish talk; he should be encouraged to employ fine and elegant speech, and to greet others in a graceful manner.[49]

The boy must also become accustomed to obeying his parents, teachers and trainers: he should regard them with respect and honour, and fear them. If the teacher chastises him, the boy must learn not to be fretful; he must not cry or ask anyone to intercede for him, for such is the conduct of servants or slaves without fortitude.

It is vital also that the boy be accustomed to serving himself and his teacher and all who are older than he. However, it is the sons of the wealthy and affluent who most need to be brought up and accustomed to this conduct.

Despite all that has been indicated, the person who cares for the boy and undertakes his training has the duty to give him the opportunity for rest, and also must be kind and reward him for good conduct.

Miskawayh often transmitted these guidelines verbatim, but sometimes varied and expanded on it in a style much finer than that of the Arabic translation contained in the manuscript kept in the Egyptian National Library.[50]

It is most likely that Miskawayh did not continuously copy from the Greek philosopher Bryson, but rather added material of his own which he considered complemented what he had borrowed. His personal opinions were influenced either by his own experience or by his Islamic environment.

Some of the opinions he set forth confirm his awareness of the importance of the early stages of growth, for on these are built many features of the person's future character, as we now know. Miskawayh confirmed the importance of the first years in the boy's upbringing, and the influence of the environment on his character in the light of his personal experience.

He made deductions from the past. This is clear in his reference to the virtuous kings of Persia, who would not educate their sons among their retinue, their servants and their companions for fear that they should be influenced by them. Instead, the Persian kings used to send their sons to distant regions in the company of trustworthy men where their education was undertaken by hardy people living a harsh life, who were strangers to luxury or ease. These kings of Persia were imitated by many of the powerful leaders in the Abbasid caliphate at that time, who would remove their sons to distant places, so that they could grow up far from wicked people and customs.[51]

Being at some temporal distance from his Greek teachers, Miskawayh soon differed from them. He stated that the first of all teachings is the Shari'a, which must be inculcated into the human being while still young since it is the foundation on which character is later built. As Miskawayh affirms, it is 'that which reforms the young and accustoms them to good deeds, prepares their souls to accept wisdom and seek virtues and reach human happiness, with sound thought and correct reasoning'.[52] This being so, the responsibility for children's upbringing and directing them in accordance with the requirements of the law falls on the shoulders of the parents.[53]

This means that the first years of education, or years of upbringing as Miskawayh called them, are the basic years. Attention must be paid to them, and he concluded:

> Whoever in his youth happens to be brought up by the rules of the Shari'a, and is made to observe its duties and provisions until he is accustomed to them, then studies books of ethics until these manners and good qualities are confirmed in his soul by proof; then he studies arithmetic and geometry, so he becomes accustomed to true speech and correct demonstration.[54]

Here Miskawayh made religion a foundation for training and refinement. After the supports of faith are established in the boy's soul, he can study books on ethics, arithmetic and geometry, or whatever can be deduced by rational arguments. While it can be said that this shows clear evidence that his intellectual orientation was strongly marked by the Islamic environment and the culture in

which he was brought up, as is made clear in the texts we have quoted, he does not specify any particular law or definite religion.[55]

Whatever the opinion, knowledge of the law is only an introduction or a preparatory stage for souls that will later accept wisdom, for with continued growth the soul can reach the stage of longing for the sciences and knowledge, and seeking virtues, and reaching human happiness.[56] By becoming accustomed to virtues and persevering in them, it becomes easy for the boy to reach 'the high rank of philosophy'.[57]

Observations and critique

The preceding pages give a picture of the basic features of Miskawayh's educational ideas which he put forward in one of the most important of his books; it also contains a selection of his words from *Kitāb al-sa'āda* [The Book of Happiness]. His words of 'advice to the seeker of wisdom' or philosophy which were included in Yāqūt's biographical dictionary of literary men (*Mu'jam al-udabā'*) drew a picture of the philosopher of ethics as he imagined him. This is explained and repeated in his words in the *Tahdhib*.[58] It is also possible to glean from the books referred to and the rapid overview of his opinions a clear picture of Greek influence on the thinking of a Muslim philosopher who drew on the culture of the age in which he lived and took from it what was best. He had the greatest admiration for, and confidence in, the famous Greek philosophers, those who still hold their place in human thought. This confirms the clarity of his vision and his ability to choose among the different kinds of culture reaching Islamic community; indeed, it also confirms the ability of the Islamic civilization to enrich the sciences coming from previous civilizations, to make use of them, to work with them and add to them.

This is emphasized by Miskawayh's indication that he borrowed what he found suitable to his aim in the works of the Greek 'Brusun', as he referred to him. Of all the Muslim philosophers and thinkers whose intellectual works have come down to us, he is the only one to acknowledge this.

There are some who think that, apart from Miskawayh, certain other well-known Muslim philosophers – such as Avicenna and al-Ghazālī – borrowed from this book of Greek origin, though they did not acknowledge it as their source.[59]

Further clarification can be found in the work of the orientalist, M. Plessner, who in the 1920s published an 'Arabic' translation of a Greek text entitled *Kitāb Brīsun fī tadbīr al-rajul li-manzilihi* [Book by Bryson on Domestic Economy] (Heidelberg, 1928). He observed that *Kitāb al-Siyasa* [The Book of Policy] attributed to Avicenna is no more than a summary of Bryson's book.[60] When comparing 'The Book of Policy' published by Louis Cheikho, in a collection of ancient philosophical texts by famous Arabic philosophers (*Maqalat falsafiyya qadima li-ba'd mashahir falasafat al-'arab*, Beirut, 1911), he found that the content is concerned with the theme:

that the human being is a civil animal needing to live in society for the sake of fulfilling his basic needs. He divides up man's policy for his needs or the management of his affairs into five sections: a man's conduct of himself, directing his income and expenditure, ruling his family (wife), guidance for his children, and governing his servants. What comes under these headings in the Book of Policy is a precise summary of what is in Bryson's previously mentioned book.[61]

This is what has been said by some, to explain Avicenna's borrowing from Bryson. Al-Ghazālī may have done the same, although he does not indicate that he borrowed from anyone. However, a reading of the section in *Ihya' 'ulum al-din* [The Revival of the Religious Sciences] on the training of boys, entitled 'Explanation of the Way to Exercise Boys When They Are First Growing, and How to Train Them and Improve Their Character',[62] shows clearly many points of resemblance to what was said by Miskawayh, which has led some to say that al-Ghazālī copied from Miskawayh without acknowledging the fact.[63] As it is now known that Miskawayh borrowed from and clearly defined his Greek source, it may be said that the source of both was the same – the Greek heritage may have been translated into Arabic in a variety of versions. In this case perhaps al-Ghazālī copied directly from Bryson's text, which was well known before his time and perhaps also during it, and not from Miskawayh; alternatively, he may have read both the Greek original and Miskawayh, and borrowed from both of them. In any case, not much real difference exists between the translation and the writings.

Despite all this, the fact remains that both were influenced by an Arabic translation known as *The Book of Brīsun [or Brisis] on Domestic Economy*, and that each of them still kept his distinctive viewpoint and his aim in training young men, and particularly boys, and other aspects of his general philosophy. Perhaps it can also be said that, although al-Ghazālī was influenced by this text, his expression of the final aim of training young boys remained closer to the spirit of Islamic religion than Miskawayh's. For al-Ghazālī the actual content of education, or its material, was taken from the Koran and the *Prophet's sunna*.[64]

It should also be pointed out that Miskawayh was content simply to talk about the training of boys, without giving any details concerning the content of this training or the educational material they should learn; likewise he did not refer to the teachers, or to their manners and culture, as did others whose aims were in fact to write about the educational process and things connected with it.[65]

If Miskawayh wove together his thinking from both religious and philosophical sources, or did not hesitate to take over what the minds of wise men had concluded in the moral realm and corresponded to the objectives of the *Islamic* shari'a, this influence from foreign cultures was not entirely good. What is particularly noticeable in everything Miskawayh wrote is that he spoke only about the training of boys. He excluded girls and did not direct any obvious attention towards them, or to women in general. In this he was influenced by the

source from which he drew, or the portion of the book which he used, and did not modify it. In this case, it would seem that Miskawayh was writing for an imaginary, non-existent society, one in which women had no place; thus, he restricted his discussion to boys, the men of tomorrow, and no more. It has been said that he did acknowledge the existence of women in his society, yet the evil opinions widespread about them influenced by the new cultures meant that he did not pay any attention to them. The philosophers, or those who were influenced by the new philosophies, opposed the spirit of Islam and what was decreed by tradition (*hadīth*) and the *sunna* of the Prophet on this point in particular, confining themselves to men when expressing their educational opinions, and keeping women well outside their concerns in the sphere of teaching.[66]

Miskawayh did distance himself from daily life on this point. The rules of conduct he presented and the exercises desirable for training young boys did not show any concern for their existence in everyday life. He did not prepare them for practical human life; on the contrary, they were prepared for a life closer to that of the military – harsh, tough and ascetic. In addition to this, what they would acquire as a result of this endeavour would be much clearer when the soul freed itself from the body; for the reward is in the hereafter, when this life is finished, when the spirit will obtain closeness to the Perfectly Happy.

Although Miskawayh wrote of life in a community, and its necessity for human existence, he did not refer to the various occupations that are necessary and important to maintain the existence of this community and the human beings living in it. That is, he did not speak about preparing the boy for work, and his various roles as producer and consumer, and a profession or craft to provide for his future. Referring to his words about the necessity of linking learning with action, it would seem that the action meant here is human conduct in general, and not productive work from the economic angle as we understand it today. This also places him nearer the thought of the new culture, which elevated intellectual activity and left 'work' to the lower orders in society – to servants and slaves. Thus, he did not consider preparation for earthly life, from the angle of work and acquiring a livelihood, to be among the aims of bringing up and training young boys. This could be interpreted as saying that his book was intended for the élite, not for the general public; he was presenting an education suitable for a learned, thinking élite, with sufficient time on their hands and an ample lifestyle permitting them to strive for purity of the soul. Then the aim of training could be concentrated on benefit for the individual in the first place and not for the whole community.

Although responsibility for refining and purifying the soul is an individual one, with every person responsible for himself in the first place, and only subsequently being required to complement these virtues by helping others along the way, Miskawayh did not speak of acts of worship obligatory for all Muslims, for these are responsibilities which fall on the shoulders of the adult person. Nor did Miskawayh mention any of the foundations of culture in the Islamic community, except for religion, and the learning and sciences closely connected with it.

Perhaps he considered this among the matters that are completed at an early stage of life, which the individual can reach and practise without much assistance; or that they already have their foundations to which the boy can be directed. Therefore, what he presents in his book is concerned with particular matters known only to the privileged. This may be borne out by the fact that Miskawayh's ideas about training young boys were only one part of his ethical thinking, and not one of his primary aims.[67]

To sum up the foregoing, the basic aim of training, exercise and the acquisition of knowledge, and its application, is the refinement and purification of the soul: thus fulfilling its perfection in this world, and reaching its happiness which is realized by proximity to the Perfectly Happy.

So the basic and final aim of training is an ethical aim, although it speaks of closeness to God by way of seeking to resemble Him in the hope of proximity to Him, and acquiring absolute happiness through this proximity. On the basis of what Miskawayh said about happiness by closeness to the Perfectly Happy, this idea is taken mainly from Aristotle. It is not the satisfaction of God and attaining the reward in His paradise which God the Most High promised to His servants who follow His commands and avoid what He prohibits. It is confirmed that 'Perfect Happiness' is not one of the attributes of God the Most High in the Islamic view; thus, bringing the human soul to realize supreme happiness by closeness to the Perfectly Happy after being set free from the body, in the picture presented by Miskawayh, expresses only an ethical, philosophical aim, rather than a religious aim. Hence, although Miskawayh lived in an Islamic cultural environment, he directed his intellect to Greek thought. His aims for upbringing, training and refinement, or education in today's language, were an expression of a borrowed culture, not the culture in which he lived. Nevertheless, the basic credit here goes to the spirit predominant in the Islamic community, which could permit at least some of its thinkers to transmit, or be influenced by, past cultures without impediment; and it also confirms the idea of the meeting of cultures and the cross-fertilization of world civilizations and their mutual influence in an ongoing movement of human thought. The human being will always remain capable of producing knowledge, seeking to increase it, transmitting it to others, adding to it and renewing it; this means that, following Miskawayh's example, continual care and attention should be paid to the refinement of character and the purification of dispositions.

Notes

1. See, for instance: Adam Metz, *al-hadārat al-islamiyya fī l-qarn al-rābic'al-hijrī* [Islamic Civilization in the Fourth Century a.h.] (trans. by Muhammad 'Abd al-Hadi Abu Rayda), Cairo, Lijnat al-ta'lif wa-l-tarjama wa-l-nashr, 1957.
2. See, for instance: Abu Hayyan al-Tawhidi, *al-Imta' wa-l-mu'cānasa* [Delight and Sociability], Beirut, Maktabat al-Hayāt, n.d.; T. J. De Boer, *Tā'rīkh al-falsafa fī l-Islam* [History of Philosophy in Islam] (trans. by Muhammad 'Abd al-Hadi Abu Rayda), Cairo, Lijnat . . ., 1938.

3. 'Abd al-'Azız 'Izzat, *Ibn Mıskawayh, falsafatuhu al-akhlāqıyya wa-masādiruha* [Ibn Miskawayh: His Ethical Philosophy and Its Sources], p. 80, Caıro, Maktaba wa-Matba'at Mustafa al-Babi al-Halabi, 1946. For more detail on the life of Miskawayh, see pp. 77-123.
4. For more detaıl on books translated from Greek ın particular, and theır translators, see for example: Ibn al-Nadim (Abu l-Faraj Muhammad b. Abi Ya'qub Ishaq, known as al-Warraq), *Kitāb al-Fıhrist* [Book of Catalogues] (ed. by Rida Tajaddud), Tehran, 1971. Profiles of al-Fārābī, Aristotle and Plato are included ın this series of '100 Thinkers on Education'.
5. For more detaıl, additional to the above, see: al-Qıfti (Jamal al-Din Abu l-Mahasın 'Ali b. al-Qadi al-Ashraf Yusuf), *Ikhbār al-'ulamā' bı-akhbār al-hukamā'* [On Wise Men and Philosophers], Beirut, Dār al-Athār lı-l-taba'a wa-l-nashr wa-l-tawzī', n.d.
6. 'Izzat, op. cıt., pp. 349 et seq.
7. For more detail on the special effect of the wrıtings of this period on Islamic civilizatıon, in addition to Metz, op. cıt., see: Ahmad Amin, *Zuhr al-Islām* [Islam's Noonday], Cairo, Maktabat al-Nahda al-Mısriyya, 1966, 4 parts.
8. Abū 'Ali ahmad b. Muhammad, known as Ibn Miskawayh, *Tahdhīb al-akhlāq* [Treatise on Ethics], p. 76, Cairo, Maktabat Muhammad 'Alı Subayh, 1959. We thınk the most reliable opinion ıs that his name was Miskawayh, not 'Ibn Miskawayh'; but this work ıs not edıted, and the name on the cover is 'Ibn Miskawayh'. It is necessary to poınt out that ıt is gıven thus on the cover, in accordance with usual academıc practices.
9. Ibid., p. 76.
10. Ibid., p. 30.
11. Ibıd., p. 7.
12. ibid., p. 137.
13. 'Izzat, op. cit., 387.
14. (Ibn) Miskawayh, op. cıt., pp. 226-35.
15. Ibid., p. 3.
16. Ibid., pp. 40-41.
17. Ibid., pp. 42, 60, 203.
18. 'Izzat, op. cit., p. 383.
19. For more detail on the varıous meanings and uses of thıs word, see: Nadia Gamāl al-Dīn, *Ma'a kitāb tahdhīb al-akhlāq wa-tathır al-a'raq* [On Refinement of Character and Purificatıon of Dispositions], ın: Hassan Muhammad Hassan and Nadıa Gamāl al-Dīn, *Mādarıs al-tarbiya fī l-hadāra al-ıslāmiyya* [Schools of Education in Islamic Civılızation], pp. 194-98, Cairo, Dar al-fikr al-'arabı, 1984.
20. For more detail on this poınt ın particular see: Abdel Fattah Galāl, *Mın usūl al-tarbiya fī l-Islām* [On the Sources of Educatıon in Islam], Sars al-liyan, Matba'at al-markaz al-duwali li-l-ta'lim al-wazifi li-l-kıbɔr fı l-'alam al-'arabi, 1977, pp. 17 et. seq.
21. (Ibn) Miskawayh, op. cit., p. 35.
22. Ibid.
23. For more detail, and for information on what Miskawayh borrowed from the Greek philosopher Aristotle, and his books translated into Arabic, see: 'Izzat, op. cit., pp. 366 et seq. On the comparison with what Miskawayh mentioned, taken from the book of 'Brusun', as he referred to his name, translated into Arabic, see ibıd., pp. 425 ff. This point will be treated ın detail below.

24. For more detail see ibid.
25. (Ibn) Miskawayh, op. cit., p. 36.
26. Ibid., p. 31.
27. Ibid., pp. 66-67.
28. Ibid., p. 76.
29. Ibid., pp. 34-35.
30. Ibid., p. 126.
31. Ibid., pp. 64-65.
32. Ibid., p. 176.
33. Ibid., p. 67.
34. Ibid., p. 177.
35. Ibid., p. 174.
36. Ibid., pp. 75, 105, 125, 175.
37. Ibid., p. 37.
38. Ibid., p. 58; see also p. 77.
39. Ibid., pp. 58-59.
40. Ibid., p. 66.
41. Ibid., p. 35.
42. Ibid.
43. Ibid., p. 60.
44. Ibid., p. 35.
45. Ibid., p. 61-64.
46. Ibid., p. 64.
47. Ibid., p. 65.
48. Ibid., 62.
49. Ibid., p. 64.
50. 'Izzat, op. cit., p. 430.
51. (Ibn) Miskawayh, op. cit., p. 66.
52. Ibid., p. 35.
53. Ibid., p. 104.
54. Ibid., p. 51.
55. Ibid., p. 35.
56. Ibid., p. 35-36.
57. Ibid., p. 65.
58. 'Izzat, op. cit., p. 137.
59. Profiles of Avicenna and al-Ghazālī are included in this series of '100 Thinkers on Education'.
60. Hisham Nashaba, *al-Turāth al-tarbawī al-islamī fī khams makhtūtāt* [The Islamic Educational Heritage in Five Manuscripts], p. 8, Beirut, Dar al-'ilm li-l-malāyīn, 1988.
61. Ibid., p. 9. See also: 'Izzat, op. cit., pp. 367, 425, 430. There is one copy of the manuscript of 'Brusun', in Dar al-kutub al-Misriyya (the Egyptian National Library), Taymur Pasha No. 290, Ethics, entitled *The Book of Brusis on Domestic Economy*; also under the title, *From the Words of the Sage Brusun on Domestic Economy*; published by the orientalist Paul Kraus, authenticating this, in the *Journal of the College of Arts* (Fu'ad I University (now Cairo University), Egypt), Vol. 5, No. 1, May 1937. 'Abd al-'Aziz 'Izzat gave many details in his book, q.v.

62. Imam al-Ghazālī, *Ihyā' 'ulūm al-dīn* [Revival of the Religious Sciences], foreword by Badawī Tabana, pp. iii. 69-72, Egypt, Dār Ihyā' al-kutub al-'arabiyya, n.d.
63. Zaki Mubarak, *al-Akhlāq 'inda al-Ghazālī* [Ghazālī's Ethics], pp. 224 et seq., Cairo, Dār al-kitāb al-'arabi li-l-tiba'a wa-l-nashr, 1968.
64. For more detail, see: Muhammad Nabil Nawfal, *Abī Hāmid al-Ghazālī wa-ara'uhu fī l-tarbiya wa-l-ta'līm* [Abu Hamid al-Ghazālī and His Views on Education], p. 339, Cairo, Maktabat Kulliyat al-tarbiya, 'Ayn Shams University, 1967. (Unpublished M.A. thesis.)
65. See, for instance: Ben Sahnun, 'Adāb al-mu'allimīn' [Manners of Teachers], and al-Qabisi (Abu l-Hasan 'Alī b. Khalaf), 'al-Risāla al-mufassila li-ahwāl al-muta'allimīn wa-l-mu'allimīn' [Detailed Epistle on the Conditions of Learners and Teachers], both published in Ahmad Fu'ad al-Ahwani, *al-Tarbiya fī l-Islām* [Education in Islam], Cairo, Dār al-ma'ārif al-misriyya, 1961.
66. See, for instance, Nadia Gamāl al-Dīn, *Falsafat al-tarbiya 'inda Ikhwān al-Safā'* [Philosophy of Education in (the Views of) the Brethren of Purity], Cairo, al-Markaz al-'arabī lī-l-sahāfa, 1983.
67. For more details on the sources of this objective, see 'Izzat, op. cit., p. 368.

Works by Miskawayh

Miskawayh did not devote any particular book to education, but many of his writings dealt with this subject. The most important of Miskawayh's writings have been printed several times:

Ahmad b. Muhammad Ya'qūb (Miskawayh). *Tahdhīb al-akhlāq wa-tathīr al-a'rāq* [Treatise on Ethics and Purification of Dispositions]. Cairo, Maktabat Muhammad 'Ali Subayh, 1959. (There are numerous printings of this book, including the one edited by Qustantin Zurayq, Beirut, Maktabat al-hayāt, 1966.)

Miskawayh (Abu 'Ali Ahmad b. Muhammad). *Tajārib al-umam* [Experiences of Nations]. (Ed. H. F. Amedroz.) Egypt, Matba'at sharikat al-tamaddun al-sina'iyya, 1915.

(Ibn) Miskawayh. *Al-Fauz al-asghar* [The Smallest Achievement]. Egypt, Mustafa al-kutubi, A.H. 1325 (1988).

Abu Hayyan al-Tawhidi; Miskawayh. *al-Hawāmil wa-l-shawāmil* [Carriers and Groups]. Cairo, Ahmad Amin; Matba 'at Lajnat al-ta'līf wa-l-tarjama wa-l-nashr, 1951.

'Abd al-'Aziz 'Izzat. *Ibn Miskawayh wa-falsafatuhu al-akhlāqiyya wa-masadiruha* [Ibn Miskawayh, His Ethical Philosophy and Its Sources], pp. 125-41, Cairo, Maktabat wa-matba'at al-Bābī al-Halabī, 1946. The pages referred to contain a bibliography of Miskawayh's surviving works, printed and in manuscript, still preserved in libraries around the world. His manuscripts include items written on the margins of other manuscripts, which are not independent works. Miskawayh's advice to the seeker of wisdom, for example, we find published in the book of Yaqut al-Hamawi, *Mu'jam al-udabā'* [The Dictionary of Learned Men] (more usually ma'rifat al-udabā'), ed. Margoliouth, pp. ii. 49 et seq.

Of the books of Miskawayh still extant:

Kitāb Tahārat al-nafs [Purification of the Soul]. Microfilm No. 417, Philosophy, in the Egyptian National Library.

Jāvīdhān Khirad [Eternal Wisdom]. Microfilm in Library of Cairo University, on the margin of manuscript of *Nuzhat al-arwāh wa-raudat al-afrāh* of Shahrazuri, No. 23005. (In Persian.)

Works about Miskawayh

Ahmad al-Amin al-Husayni al-'Amili. *A'yān al-Shi'a* [Notable Shi'ites]. Damascus, 1938.

Brockelmann, C. *Geschichte der arabischen Literatur* [History of Arabic Literature]. Leiden, 1937. (Supplement.)

Da'irat al-ma'arif al-islāmiyya. Vol. 1, pp. 388-89, Cairo, Dār al-sha'b, n.d.

Nadia Gamāl al-Dīn. *Ma'a kitāb tahdhib al-akhlaq wa-tathir al-a'rāq* [On Refinement of Character and the Purification of Dispositions]. In: Hassan Muhammad Hassan; Nadia Gamāl al-Dīn (eds.). *Madāris al-tarbiya fī l-hadara al-Islāmiyya* [Schools of Education in Islamic Civilization], pp. 268, 301. Cairo, Dār al-fikr al-'arabī, 1984.

Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics. (Ed. by J. Hastings.) New York, N.Y., Scribner's, 1908-27. 13 v.

Ibn al-Nadim (Abu l-Faraj Muhammad b. Ya'qub Ishaq, known as al-Warraq). *Kitāb al-Fihrist* (Fihrist: Index). (Ed. by Rida Tajaddud.) Tehran, 1971.

Khayr al-Din al-Zarkali. *Al-A'lām* [Luminaries]. Egypt, 1927.

Al-Qifti (Jamal al-Din Abu l-Mahasin 'Ali b. al-Qadi al-Ashraf Yusuf). *Ikhbar al-'ulama' bi-akhbar al-hukama'* (Ta'rikh al-hukama') [Dictionary of Wise Men]. Beirut, Dār al-Athar li-l-tiba'a wal-nashr wa-l-tawzi', n.d.

Sa'id al-Diwaji. 'Ibn Miskawayh'. *Min a'lām al-tarbiya al-'arabiyya al-islamiyya* [Some Luminaries of Arabic Islamic Education], pp. 221-42. Riyadh, Maktab al-tarbiya al-'arabi li-duwal al-khalij, 1988.

MONTAIGNE[1]

(1533–92)

Gérard Wormser

[A] . . . and just as women left alone may sometimes be seen to produce shapeless lumps of flesh but need to be kept busy by a semen other than her own in order to produce good natural offspring: so too with our minds. If we do not keep them busy with some particular subject which can serve as a bridle to reign them in, they charge ungovernably about, ranging to and fro over the wastelands of our thoughts.[2]

[B] . . . I love terms which soften and tone down the rashness of what we put forward, terms such as 'perhaps', 'somewhat', 'some', 'they say', 'I think' and so on. And if I had had sons to bring up I would have trained their lips to answer with [C] inquiring and undecided [B] expressions such as, 'What does this mean?' 'I do not understand that', 'It might be so', 'Is that true?' so that they would have been more likely to retain the manners of an apprentice at sixty than, as boys do, to act like learned doctors at ten. Anyone who wishes to be cured of ignorance must first admit to it: [C] Iris is the daughter of Thaumantis: amazement is the foundation of all philosophy; inquiry, its way of advancing; and ignorance is its end. [B] Yes indeed: there is a kind of ignorance, strong and magnanimous, which in honour and courage is in no wise inferior to knowledge; [C] you need no less knowledge to beget such ignorance than to beget knowledge itself.[3]

The place of Montaigne

Michel de Montaigne, who died a century after Christopher Columbus first crossed the Atlantic, lived in a period in which European identity was deeply disturbed by the dynamic forces at work in a variety of fields. No longer identifying itself with Christendom alone, Europe was making a radical break with the set of references which had for centuries guided its development. The splitting up of the linguistic areas in which culture developed might be regarded as the clearest evidence of this. Although, in the sixteenth century, literary and scientific works were still being produced in Latin, national literatures were established everywhere and the greatest masterpieces were then written in the vulgar tongues. The *Essays* are a particularly good illustration of the cultural mosaic of

Renaissance Europe: Montaigne's prose is interlarded with Latin quotations – often translated in turn from the Greek – but also compounded with expressions drawn from a popular heritage. This diversity expresses both the convergence of a variety of experiences leading to a philosophy of existence based on a strong concern with comparisons, and the inappropriateness of dogmatic judgements in most real-life situations.

This being so, interpretations of his work have inevitably wavered between the formulation of a 'wisdom' made up of tolerance and humanity, and reliance on the absolute value of Classical literary culture, on the one hand, and a melancholy and disillusioned scepticism, on the other, produced as much by his experience of the religious conflicts of his day as by the Socratic knowledge that it is impossible to make virtue the rule of life in organized communities. These two interpretations shared a common dimension, which has since become the accepted opinion: living at the time of the invention (by the bourgeoisie) of the individual, and the literary exploration of the innermost recesses of one's own mind, Montaigne is regarded as a precursor of the modern spirit. In this respect, the pages he devoted to education, referring as they do both to the virtues of book learning and the need for teaching methods based on the exercise of judgement and continuous dialogue, have become the emblem of an open conception of education.

Actually, not many of the objectives, or even the methods, formulated by educationists could be justified by a few remarks of Montaigne, not because of any eclecticism on his part, but rather because he had seen through the social and psychological forces which in the long run make education a form of conditioning instead of awakening to the world. For this very reason we should not be content with classifyng his texts as a fund of general maxims; if we are to reach an exact reading we must first measure the distance between Montaigne and the present situation.

The paradox of Montaigne

Let us not delude ourselves: looking for the lineaments of an educator in Montaigne is truly paradoxical. Not only did his century in the main precede the generalization of school education, but Montaigne was not one of those who advocated its development:

> Those who follow our French practice and undertake to act as schoolmaster for several minds diverse in kind and capacity, using the same teaching and the same degree of guidance for them all, not surprisingly can scarcely find in a whole tribe of children more than one or two who bear fruit from their education.[4]

What is more, Montaigne's scepticism is far removed from the Cartesian formulation of the 'method of rightly conducting the reason and searching after truth in the sciences' (1637), and is scarcely consistent with the standard-setting dimension which seems inseparable from all education.

Admittedly, Montaigne shares the concerns of his contemporaries: the emphasis on history, on accounts of newly discovered lands and the customs of their inhabitants and on references to education through recreational activities such as play-acting and physical training are in keeping with the first courses of study offered in the Jesuit colleges of Gascony between 1560 and 1590. The modern breakaway was effected in two steps. First, to the reading of the classics, set up as models, was added history, 'which teaches us how to live'. Montaigne makes this clear at the beginning of his essay, 'De l'institution des enfans' [On Educating Children], by ranking historians along with poets at the top of the hierarchy of references. At a later stage, the heterogeneous nature of this education was to make way for a reform of institutions of learning: from the 1640s on, the Cartesian revolution set aside the humanistic approach and Montaigne was regarded as a particular moment in thought when the Latin humanities of Erasmus, already giving way to a culture of historical accounts closer to the experience of the time, had not yet been subjected to criticism on the part of the scientific modernism which established itself as the educational norm in the course of the seventeenth century.

Montaigne's conception, despite its similarities with the curricula of the first Jesuit colleges, is rather different; and it is appropriate to recall here the opinion expressed by Durkheim:

> Montaigne is not far from ending up with a sort of educational nihilism of relative consistency. In fact, his view is that the educator has no hold on what constitutes the basis of our nature. . . . There is no question of a real culture of the intellect, of a culture designed to train the mind as such.[5]

This opinion, despite its exaggerated character, might be reconciled with a reading of Montaigne as an educational thinker – not so much a precursor of the modern school as the founder of a tradition of critics of educational institutions, a necessary counterbalance to the education systems. Though elegant, this interpretation is contradictory, as Durkheim pointed out: How can one reconcile a belief in teaching methods calculated to develop learning with a sceptical view according to which our nature is not governed by rational rules of conduct? Rather are we carried along by our characters, which lie at the root of our essential attitudes, and it is these that combine with the logics of mimicry to determine all manner of conditioned outbursts in social life.

So Montaigne calls for a more radical interpretation. Learning provides no positive standard; it merely enables us to know how far the conduct of individuals departs from what a wise nature would prompt. Besides being incorrigible, faculties are distributed at random. Education serves above all to bring them out so that the best characters car be discovered. This is what Montaigne has in mind when he jestingly recommends that the tutor should quickly strangle the unworthy pupil when nobody is looking or apprentice him to some trade which will keep him occupied. Education would thus mainly serve a negative purpose, seeking to cast out vices likely to develop and become a danger to human society.

Unconvinced of the influence education was supposed to have on us, Montaigne has no difficulty in showing how the natural disposition comes out under all circumstances or sets impassable limits to everyone's behaviour, even if that natural disposition is concealed by disguises and masks which give it false colours and belie it.

While Montaigne can be regarded as a precursor of Rousseau's negative attitude to education, it would be much more tricky to trace back any theory of Descartes or Pascal to a tradition inspired by Montaigne, despite their textual and thematic borrowings. The ideas on which the development of schools in France is based might even be legitimately considered as sufficient proof of the little influence Montaigne's thought has had on the structuring of studies in his own country, the correspondence of Montaigne's thought with deeper aspects of French culture notwithstanding. Descartes, in whom the metaphysics of the *Cogito* provides the foundation for a scientific method of knowing things – and knowing oneself as being made up of a *res extensa* and a *res cogitans* – or Pascal, for whom the revelation of the Mystery of Jesus influenced temporal life once and for all, would seem more 'representative' to anyone wanting to draw up a history of institutional educational thought. Montaigne's specificity will therefore be sought in what is incompatible with the Cartesian project or Pascal's thought – no revealed historicity, no method to direct the mind, but consideration of the relative docility with which the natural disposition adopts learned behaviours, some deliberately, others not. This seems to rule out the traditional reading of the *Essays*. There is no longer any question of confidence in human beings: any constituted disposition vanishes, leaving a mosaic of faculties combined at random in a person more often than not powerless to act on his or her destiny.

Montaigne's own life confirms this approach. After retiring from public affairs shortly before the outbreak of the Wars of Religion in France (Massacre of St Bartholomew, 1572), he devoted himself to writing. The first two books came out in 1580; the third was added in the 1588 edition. Right up to his death, Montaigne made many augmentations (*allongeails*), which were usually very significant in that they clarified the trend of his thought. Throughout these years, Montaigne explained his ideas and expanded on his own cast of mind to the extent of reflecting as much his mood of the moment as the evolution of his character.

'On educating children'

The texts devoted to the upbringing of children are grouped together in the vicinity of the essay, 'De l'institution des enfans' [On Educating Children] (I.26). This set of well-linked practical proposals is a part of the complex series following the famous essay, 'Que philosopher c'est apprendre à mourir' [To Philosophize Is to Learn How to Die] (I.20). After discussing the aims people can assign to life – '[C] Life itself is neither a good nor an evil: life is where good or evil find a place, depending on how you make it for them'.[6] – Montaigne tackles

the themes essential to any philosophy of education by dealing with the imagination and habit: How is the human mind affected by its inner urges and by elements from the outside world? Our imagination produces many effects in reality and provides the most telling evidence against the primacy of the will in human behaviour. Our bodies are in many instances not subordinated to our wills; by and large, the body is more accessible to the imagination than governable by the will. One has only to reflect on the first love story that comes to mind; Montaigne can argue even more conclusively from the various symptoms that affect everyone and which psychoanalysis was later to describe – phobias, lapses of memory, recurrence and fixations of all kinds. In animals, too, the influence of ideation is evident – for example, domestic animals dying from grief over the deaths of their owners and, more convincingly, animals immobilizing their prey by holding their gaze.

Habit, even when based on a figment of the imagination 'gradually and stealthily . . . slides her authoritative foot into us; then, having by this gentle and humble beginning planted it firmly within us, helped by time she later discloses an angry tyrannous countenance, against which we are no longer allowed even to lift up our eyes'.[7] Whereupon Montaigne concludes that 'our greatest vices do acquire their bent during our most tender infancy, so that our formation is chiefly in the hands of our wet-nurses'.[8] The hold which imagination and habit acquire over children's attitudes can therefore be judged from their earliest expression. If children are not taught to detest their natural vices, 'whatever mask they hide behind',[9] 'what is the use of educating them?' Whatever our opinion on the matter, we must realize that all behaviour, all value judgements, are based to some extent on habit, or custom, for the habits, or customs, of the place where you were born, widely though these may differ from one place to another, rule your conscience. This line of thought is continued in the brief essay on credulity, 'That it is madness to judge the true and the false from our own capacities': 'How many of the things which constantly come into our purview must be deemed monstrous or miraculous if we apply such terms to anything which outstrips our reason!'[10]

The essence of any education is thus the way in which it inculcates moral principles consistent with the goal of wisdom and calculated to develop a conscience enabling us all to bring our behaviour in line with incontestable standards. For this reason, Montaigne mercilessly mocks teachers who, unable to get the children to assimilate what they are taught, are content with puffing them up with it, making them conceited and arrogant: '[A] Learned we may be with another man's learning: we can only be wise with wisdom of our own'.[11] Hence '[A] since I would prefer that he turned out to be an able man not an erudite one, I would wish you to be careful to select as guide for him a tutor with a well-formed rather than a well-filled brain.'[12]

Only on this condition can we rediscover the Socratic method of teaching by means of exercises in which the pupil shows his capacity for discernment. However difficult this may be, it is possible '[C] to judge how far down the tutor

needs to go to adapt himself to his ability. If we get that proportion wrong we spoil everything; knowing how to find it and to remain well-balanced within it is one of the most arduous tasks there is. It is the action of a powerful elevated mind to know how to come down to the level of the child and to guide his footsteps.'[13] Education seen in this light is aimed not so much at burdening the memory as developing a keen mind. Here Montaigne takes inspiration again from Plato, advocating teaching by means of a dialogue in which the variety of examples and cases gradually leads to the building up of an idea or the working out of an approach or a problem. With this method, questioning must become a set of 'reflexes' so ingrained that they appear innate, because what we have really digested is entirely our own: '[C] To follow another is to follow nothing' . . . '[A] the boy will transform his borrowings; he will confound their forms so that the end-product is entirely his: namely, his judgement, the forming of which is the only aim of his toil, his study and his education. [C] Let him hide the help he received and put only his achievements on display.'[14]

Since principles of judgement are neither abstract nor general but always relate to the essence of the objects concerning which judgement is exercised, variety in such exercises is paramount. This intention comes first in every subject, indicating the need for basing pupils' autonomy on an increased capacity for discernment and endurance. The attention paid to physical training has a direct bearing on this: '[C] Pain and discomfort in training are needed to break him in for the pain and discomfort of dislocated joints, of the stone and of cauterizings - and of dungeons and tortures as well.'[15]

The indispensable 'school of conversation among men' is the subject of recommendations concerning the attitude to adopt in company – reticence and modesty, but eagerness to learn. Montaigne warns strongly against pledging one's freedom of judgement for personal gain. This aspect shows how easily his advice concerning education can be applied to attitudes in politics. He wants the pupil to be prepared for the making of lucid decisions whenever a decision may have consequences for the pupil or for others. Montaigne had no intention of painting the world in brighter colours than it deserves and so an important part of education was being able to forget general principles and to concentrate on singular and exceptional cases which could either serve as examples to be admired or arouse disgust. The object of this approach, which is fostered by the reading of the historians, is to enable the pupil to reject ruling opinions. The ability shown by the young La Boétie in discerning in Plutarch elements which he was to take as the theme of his *Discours de la servitude volontaire* [On Willing Slavery] is held up here as an example.

When in society, the pupil will compare individual attitudes and 'there will be engendered in him a desire for the good ones and a contempt for the bad'.[16] In this we must not rush things, for the purpose of this experience is to educate the desire and the natural faculties and not to inculcate any moral rigidity. There is no question of adding to the confusion of things by imagining that their course can be amended: history teaches us how much blood has been shed on account

of this illusion; what matters is to endure what does not depend on us and 'to restrict our life's appurtenances to their right and natural limits'.[17] This is what is essential, convergent as it happens with the teachings of philosophy, which takes first place in this education and which in turn recommends introduction to some of the positive sciences, under the direction of specialists on whom the tutor can call for assistance.

Scepticism and human nature

[C] I am offering my own human thoughts as human thoughts to be considered on their own, not as things established by God's ordinance, incapable of being doubted or challenged; they are matters of opinion not matters of faith: what I reason out *secundum me*, not what I believe *secundum Deum* – like schoolboys reading out their essays, not teaching but teachable, in a lay not a clerical manner but always deeply devout.[18]

Inserted after the last edition to appear during the author's lifetime, this statement is equivalent to a legacy: his affirmations are to be judged not so much on their substance as on the thoughts that they arouse. The different nature of human thoughts and things established by God's ordinance is assumed: the former do not coincide with the latter except by chance. To deny this, in the absence of tangible proof to the contrary, would be presumption, 'the natural, original distemper of man'.[19] Thus we see in what way Montaigne's scepticism is something quite different from relativism: it rests on a study of man in which capricious and unruly thinking is found to be the natural disposition of the mind. This is particularly evident in the 'Apology for Raymond Sebond', which contrasts the habitual behaviour of the various animate creatures with the arcana of science. Any opinion will be more soundly based on actions rather than principles contrived for the occasion. The same is true in respect of theological morality: '[C] The distinctive mark of the Truth we hold ought to be virtue, which is the most exacting mark of Truth, the closest one to heaven and the most worthy thing that Truth produces.'[20]

Since we embrace perforce the faith of our birthplace, it behoves us to act in such a way that those who do not share it gain respect for it by observing the virtue of those who profess it. So Montaigne's relativism is above all a realism that avoids fictions that conflict with experience. Turning anthropocentrism round, he seeks the signs of God's greatness in the world: 'So let us consider for a while man in isolation – man with no outside help, armed with no arms but his own and stripped of that grace and knowledge of God in which consist his dignity, his power and the very ground of his being.'[21] Pascal will have only to copy such statements to fit them into his reasoning. Montaigne bases his remarks on a reductive operation: the qualities peculiar to man are discerned outside any pre-established framework, their description being limited to that of deeds and their relationship with motivations. Any certainty is referred back to this metaphysical reductionism intended to preserve the human mind from the pre-

sumptuous illusion that the world should be under the domination of man: 'The vanity of this same thought makes him equal himself to God; attribute to himself God's mode of being; pick himself out and set himself apart from the mass of other creatures.'[22] What comes naturally to animals (things for which we have to be educated) shows that they attest to the greatness of God in Nature. Montaigne's comparative approach is not limited to human behaviour; it is extended to all forms of life. It is the organization of our actions which matters, not the way we explain them to ourselves.

The exercise of doubt will shed more light than any dogmatic knowledge: '[A] There is a plague on man: his opinion that he knows something.'[23] It is wiser to remain in a state of uncertainty than to adhere to a poorly established dogma. It is because language reveals this presumption – 'I doubt' is still an affirmation – that Montaigne adopts as his motto, '*Que scay-je?*' (What do I know?), a question which reminds us of our ignorance of the reasons behind all things, however enlightened we may be regarding this or that particular point. Since we are apt to give credence to the theories that we are continually thinking up, we must refrain from putting forward any that have not been weighed up with convincing arguments. The most diverse philosophical principles being open to question and Montaigne's own principles being formulated in fragments here and there, he says of himself: 'A new character: a chance philosopher, not a premeditated one!'[24]

This subverting of philosophical values is not without its parallel in Nietzsche. The most traditional philosophical theories, those relating to the soul in particular, reflect our fears and hopes rather than our reason, which can be bent to any end, as Pascal was to reaffirm. Chance alone leads us to some truth: through this powerlessness which we confess we render thanks to God without attributing to ourselves a greatness that is not ours.

> [A] Our minds are dangerous tools, rash and prone to go astray: it is hard to reconcile them with order and moderation. . . . We rein it in, neck and throat [the human mind], with religions, laws, customs, precepts, rewards and punishments (both mortal and immortal), and we still find it escaping from all these bonds, with its garrulousness and laxity.[25]

The variations to which our sense organs are subject, sense organs that condition our relationship with the world and our humour in general, afford countless examples of the difficulty of perceiving people's qualities objectively. A striking argument can be drawn from premonitory dreams, which occur when our minds are at the farthest remove from the lucidity with which the philosophers credit them.

Human customs are so heteroclite that any attempt to find a common denominator is defeated:

> [B] It is quite believable that natural laws exist: we can see that in other creatures. But we have lost them; that fine human reason of ours is always interfering, seeking dominance

and mastery, distorting and confounding the face of everything according to its own vanity and inconsistency.[26]

Consideration of the senses completes this panorama of our mistaken ideas. Examples are given of kinaesthetic confusion: the fear of heights seizes us when we are perfectly safe; we have only to cross our fingers when touching an object to lose all sense of its shape; illness causes all manner of sensory disorders. These changes are decisive in the absolute primacy accorded to movement and transition in the human condition. Bodin, whom Montaigne appreciated, is accused of limiting the believable to the plausible: the classical example of the young Spartans' endurance of pain serves as a basis for comments that prefigure Spinoza's 'no one knows what a body is capable of' or the 'I can' of the phenomenologists.[27]

The phenomenology of Montaigne

It remains to show how Montaigne's scepticism anticipates the phenomenological reduction practised by Husserl. The reputed humanist and teacher of moderation must make way for a Montaigne whose writings are all the more philosophical inasmuch as they are not scholastic, and open a phenomenological path to the study of the mind. He supports his reasoning with contemporary and classical texts – those of Lucretius in particular. He proceeds by comparing his most vivid impressions with similar experiences described in the works of the principal authors. Not admitting any dogmatism, Montaigne explores a method of eidetic description obtained by establishing a parallel between real-life experiences and conceptual propositions. The approach adopted in the composition of the *Essays* is to go ever more directly to the heart of the matter and fill out with further examples the rigour of the descriptions and the 'essences' derived therefrom. That is why Montaigne refrains from cutting out earlier passages when he adds to the text: the reading ties up with his experience as it has actually developed and the book becomes 'consubstantial' with its author, book and author growing up together in one and the same movement. The *Essays* record an existential and methodological discovery of which they are the protocol: seen in this light, Montaigne can rightly be regarded as an educator, the fact that he scorned book learning not invalidating this point of view.

One of the essays which has varied the most, 'Des livres' [On Books], affords clear evidence of this way of thinking:

[A] What you have here is purely an assay of my natural, not at all of my acquired, abilities. Anyone who catches me out in ignorance does me no harm: I cannot vouch to other people for my reasonings: I can scarcely vouch for them to myself and am by no means satisfied with them. . . . These are my own thoughts, by which I am striving to make known not matter but me.'

And again:

[C] Where my borrowings are concerned, see whether I have been able to select something which improves my theme: I get others to say what I cannot put so well myself, sometimes because of the weakness of my language and sometimes because of the weakness of my intellect. . . . I will love the man who can pluck out my feathers – I mean by the perspicacity of his judgement and by his sheer ability to distinguish the force and beauty of the topics.[28]

This type of reading, which he seeks to the extent of deliberately omitting the sources of certain references so that the reader will not be biased for or against, is in keeping with the emphasis on the educational value of poetry and the theatre, which illustrate the transition from one situation to another,[29] and show the psychological and educational need for experimenting with all kinds of attitudes, for putting ourselves in someone else's place to feel what it is like (*De l'institution des enfans*), and for preparing ourselves by asceticism for the changes which will affect us (I, 39), 'De la solitude' [On Solitude]). Contrary to all forms of behaviourism, Montaigne's conception of doubt holds variety in the subjects reviewed imperative: in every case there is an opportunity of rounding out descriptions aimed at going closer to the heart of things.

More basically, eidetic variation complements in the field of psychology the method of reduction developed by Montaigne in respect of knowledge:

[C] In the study I am making of our manners and motives, fabulous testimonies – provided they remain possible – can do service as well as true ones. . . . I can see this and profit by it equally in semblance as in reality. There are often different versions of a story: I make use of the one which is rarest and most memorable. There are some authors whose aim is to relate what happened: mine (if I could manage it) would be to relate what can happen.[30]

Attentive to movements and to the unforeseen element in them, Montaigne considers properties that suggest variation and categorizes possible outcomes rather than relating what happened. We must pass over the boundary of the credible and the imaginable – Montaigne insists on this above all else. The essay 'De l'exercitation' [On Practice] thus shows the possibility of a near experience of death even though death is beyond all experience: '[A] We can advance towards it; we can make reconnaissances and if we cannot drive right up to its stronghold we can at least glimpse it and explore the approaches to it.'[31]

A lengthy loss of consciousness caused by a riding accident enabled Montaigne to testify to this, for the process of coming round (which he recalled) was very slow:

To me it seemed as though my life was merely clinging to my lips. It seemed, as I shut my eyes, as though I was helping to push it out, and I found it pleasant to languish and to let myself go. It was a thought which only floated on the surface of my soul, as feeble and delicate as everything else, but it was, truly, not merely free from unpleasantness but tinged with that gentle feeling which is felt by those who let themselves glide into sleep.[32]

Montaigne dwells on his pleasant sensations at the time – the pain came after he recovered consciousness, and that was another face of death. The memory of the accident itself came back to him later – it was absent from his first recollections. The last edition brings enlightening comments that give the account general significance:

[C] No description is more difficult than the describing of oneself; and none, certainly, is more useful. . . . I am chiefly portraying my ways of thinking, a shapeless subject which simply does not become manifest in deeds. I have to struggle to couch it in the flimsy medium of words. . . . I am *all* on display, like a mummy on which at a glance you can see the veins, the muscles and the tendons, each piece in its place. . . . It is not what I do that I write of, but of me, of what I *am*.[33]

Between the first edition and the subsequent additions, Montaigne's intention became more radical: what was at first the formulation of an experience bordering on death developed into an eidetic of personal existence continued from one text to another. The essay 'Nous ne goustons rien de pur' [We Can Savour Nothing Pure] thus takes things to extremes in a speculative experience:

[C] When I picture a man besieged by all the enjoyments which he could desire – say that all his members were forever seized of a pleasure equal to that of sexual intercourse at its climax – I see him collapsing under the weight of his joy; and I can perceive him quite incapable of bearing pleasure so pure, so constant and so total: truly, once there, he runs away and naturally hastens to escape from it as from some narrow passage where he cannot find solid ground and fears to be engulfed.[34]

If too much joy is unbearable it is because admixtures are our lot. While in the first edition Montaigne was content with a literary and moral approach to this subject, this kinaesthetic fiction added in the last version shows the turn taken by his project.

Book III, written for the second edition, is particularly significative of this line of inquiry, which is clearly stated in the first essay 'De l'utile et de l'honneste' [On the Useful and the Honourable]:

[B] Our being is cemented together by qualities which are diseased. Ambition, jealousy, envy, vengeance, superstition and despair lodge in us with such a natural right of possession that we recognize the likeness of them even in the animals too – not excluding so unnatural a vice as cruelty; for in the midst of compassion we feel deep down some bittersweet pricking of malicious pleasure at seeing others suffer. Even children feel it. . . . If anyone were to remove the seeds of such qualities in man he would destroy the basic properties of our lives.[35]

The trend of the *Essays* has become more radical: exploration of the mind backs up the considerations on violence. After these remarks, Montaigne adds: '[B] The public interest requires men to betray, to tell lies [C] and to massacre.' His object therefore is not so much directly moral as phenomenological – to describe the behaviour of minds in situations in which they can act on one another. Violence

on all sides affords evidence that a misappreciation of its limits is inherent in human nature. Composite in its make-up, attaining nothing that is unalloyed, human nature is not endowed with any essence separable from its acts. It is for this reason that Montaigne adopts an existential approach when presenting a weird array of those acts. This approach is confirmed at the beginning of the essay, 'Du repentir' [On Repenting]:

> [B] Others form man; I give an account of man and sketch a picture of a particular one of them who is very badly formed and whom I would truly make very different from what he is if I had to fashion him afresh. But it is done now. The brush-strokes of my portrait do not go awry even though they do change and vary. The world is but a perennial see-saw. . . . Constancy itself is nothing but a more languid rocking to and fro. I am unable to stabilize my subject: it staggers confusedly along with a natural drunkenness. I grasp it as it is now, at this moment when I am lingering over it. I am not portraying being but becoming: not the passage from one age to another (or, as the folk put it, from one seven-year period to the next) but from day to day, from minute to minute. I must adapt this account of myself to the passing hour. I shall perhaps change soon, not accidentally but intentionally. This is a register of varied and changing occurrences, of ideas which are unresolved and, when needs be, contradictory, either because I myself have become different or because I grasp hold of different attributes or aspects of my subjects.[36]

In his essay, 'De trois commerces' [On Three Kinds of Social Intercourse], Montaigne explains that his mind requires no bookish subject to occupy it. Once again it is a matter of judgement rather than memory, of meditation rather than book learning. Those who have it exhibit such bad faith in discussion that this method of learning is again criticized in the essay, 'De l'art de conférer' [On the Art of Conversation]: Valuable though it may be,

> [B] in the kind of men (and their number is infinite) who make it the base and foundation of their worth and achievement, who quit their understanding for their memory . . . and can do nothing except by book, I loathe [it] (dare I say it?) a little more than I loathe stupidity. In my part of the country and during my own lifetime, school-learning has brought amendment of purse but rarely amendment of soul,[37]

for the use made of any learning depends on the motivations of the user: '[B] they clobber you with the authority of their experience: they have heard this; they have seen that; they have done this: you are overwhelmed with cases'.[38] This distrust is extended to any academic institution setting its own standards but unconcerned about those who personify its missions and should be judged not so much on their technical competence as on the resulting quality of judgement: '[B] The fruit of a surgeon's experience lies not in a recital of his operations . . . unless he knows how to extract from them material for forming his judgement.'[39] As for those who rule over us, of those who hold the world in their hands, '[B] they are far beneath us if they are not way above us. Since they promise more, they owe much more too.'[40] We must particularly distrust words whose allegedly general significance obscures the feeble hypotheses on which they are based.

Montaigne was therefore the progenitor of a philosophy of eidetic description backed by personal experience. Many of the remarks scattered through the essay on education reappear in these texts. They are not so much 'educational' as bound up with the anthropological descriptions which were the source of the writing of the *Essays*. For instance, '[B] the infancies of all things are feeble and weak. We must keep our eyes open at their beginnings; you cannot find the danger then because it is so small: once it has grown, you cannot find the cure.'[41] Reduced to its original structure, every modality of existence has a more basic formulation than could be reached by mere empiricism. Nor by over-abstract knowledge, for theorization is concerned only too often with phenomena the reality of which is not vouched for by a rigorous description: '[B] We, who are never-endingly confused by our own internal delusions, should not go looking for unknown ones.'[42] 'I realize that if you ask people to account for 'facts', they usually spend more time finding reasons for them than finding out whether they are true. They ignore the whats and expatiate on the whys. . . . They skip over the facts but carefully deduce inferences.'[43]

The passages from Books I and II of the *Essays* quoted here consist in the main of elements added by Montaigne in later years. The extracts from Book III, on the contrary, consist of passages which Montaigne did not retouch at all: they represent a definitive formulation of his opinion. The quotations heading this profile are an illustration of the way in which that position gained assurance. The first draft of the text refers to a natural order and notes its absence in the case of the human mind. Left to its own devices, its activity is purposeless and disorderly. Control of the imagination seems to be a possible answer; the fixing of limits seems to suffice to keep it in check. This is what is invalidated at the next stage of the draft: as each field of positive knowledge contains the seeds of further presumption, it is only from a sceptical attitude that some moderation can be expected. However, the continual resurgence of violence due to the disregard for limits demands of that scepticism that it find a method of study of the mind by itself so that a philosophical limit can be set. Montaigne's protophenomenology then becomes more radical and, going beyond the pragmatic intention, he explores more deeply the constructions peculiar to the mind. Understanding ignorance demands a specific method whereby Montaigne manages to define precisely what he was setting out to do. Self-knowledge presupposes confronting oneself both with the representations of the mind and with one's words and actions, here again not in order to become absorbed in oneself, but with a view to studying the forms of the mind and exploring its to-ing and fro-ing. This is the exercise to which Montaigne invites the reader, and in this sense an educational intention is indeed at the root of his thought.

It was owing to a retreat for meditation that Montaigne came to embody an approach essential to our understanding of the modern figure of the writer. Basically, he is not an educationist except inasmuch as he inculcates an attitude of phlegmatic distance. Nevertheless, the texts devoted to children, animals, 'savage' nations, attitudes in conversation, books, etc., present a veritable doc-

trine, provided that it is referred to the underlying thought, which becomes more and more radical as the writing of the Essays progresses. According to this conception of anthropology, disregard for the natural limits of our faculties is the mainspring of violence. Montaigne's quasi-phenomenological method of describing states of mind shows education as learning to know oneself, one's strengths and weaknesses, and becoming tough enough to accept our mortal condition. Curiosity concerning the world is evidence of the vacuity of a conscience not endowed with the treasures of the whole of humanity, which means that it is for education to build a genuine conscience.

Notes

1. Author's original title: 'Montaigne éducateur et l'invention phénoménologique' [The Educational Dimension of Montaigne and Phenomenological Invention] – Ed.
2. Montaigne, *Œuvres complètes* [Complete Works] (edited by Albert Thibaudet and Maurice Rat), Paris, Gallimard, 1962 (Collection La Pléiade). *Les essais*, I, 8, p. 33. The symbols [A], [B] and [C] used in current editions of the *Essays* refer to the three successive versions of the text, published in 1580, 1588 and 1595 respectively. References to the English translations of the passages quoted in this article are taken from Michel de Montaigne, *The Complete Essays* (translated and edited with an introduction and notes by M. A. Screech), Harmondsworth, Penguin Classics, 1993. The page reference to the English text is given in parentheses; in this case (30).
3. *Essais*, III, 11, p. 1007 (1165).
4. Ibid., I, 26, p. 149 (169).
5. Emile Durkheim, *L'évolution pédagogique en France* [The Evolution of Teaching in France], 2nd ed., p. 258, Paris, Presses Universitaires de France, 1969.
6. *Essais*, I, 20, p. 91 (104).
7. Ibid., I, 23, p. 106 (122).
8. Ibid., p. 107 (124).
9. Ibid., p. 108 (124).
10. Ibid., I, 27, p. 178 (201).
11. Ibid., I, 25, p. 137 (155).
12. Ibid., I, 26, p. 149 (168).
13. Ibid., (169).
14. Ibid., p. 151 (170-71).
15. Ibid., p. 153 (173).
16. Ibid., p. 155 (175).
17. Ibid., p. 158 (178).
18. Ibid., I, 56, p. 308 (361-62).
19. Ibid., II, 12, p. 429 (505).
20. Ibid., p. 418 (493).
21. Ibid., p. 427 (502).
22. Ibid., p. 429 (505).
23. Ibid., p. 468 (543).
24. Ibid., p. 528 (614).
25. Ibid., p. 541 (629).

26. Ibid., p. 564 (655).
27. Ibid., II, 32, p. 811 (819).
28. Ibid., II, 10, pp. 387-88 (457-58).
29. '[A] . . . the sacred inspiration of the Muses, having first seized the poet with anger, grief or hatred and driven him outside himself whither they will, then affects the actor through the poet and then, in succession, the entire audience.' (Ibid., I, 37, p. 228 (260)). It is with a reference to the theatre that Montaigne concludes his essay, 'De l'institution des enfans', and the only institutions he recommends setting up are public theatres.
30. *Essais*, I, 21, p. 104 (119).
31. Ibid., II, 6, p. 351 (417).
32. Ibid., p. 354 (420).
33. Ibid., p. 359 (424-26).
34. Ibid., II, 20, p. 656 (765-66).
35. Ibid., III, 1, pp. 767-68 (892).
36. Ibid., III, 2, p. 782 (907-08).
37. Ibid., III, 8, p. 905 (1050).
38. Ibid., p. 909 (1054).
39. Ibid., p. 909 (1055).
40. Ibid., p. 910 (1056).
41. Ibid., III, 10, p. 998 (1154).
42. Ibid., p. 1009 (1168).
43. Ibid., III, 11, pp. 1003-04 (1161).

Works about Montaigne

Dainville, F. de. *L'éducation des Jésuites* [The Education of Jesuits]. Paris, Editions de Minuit, 1978.

Friedrich, H.. *Montaigne*. Paris, Gallimard, 1949.

Kahn, P.; Ouzoulias, A.; Thierry, P. (eds.). *L'éducation: approches philosophiques* [Education: Philosophical Approaches]. Paris, Presses Universitaires de France, 1990.

Rigolot, F. *Les métamorphoses de Montaigne* [The Transformations of Montaigne]. Paris, Presses Universitaires de France, 1988.

Nakam, G. *Montaigne, la manière et la matière* [Montaigne: The Manner and the Substance]. Paris, Klincksieck, 1992.

MARIA MONTESSORI[1]

(1870–1952)

Hermann Röhrs

A life in the service of childhood

The figure of Maria Montessori stands out above most of those who were involved in the New Education. Rarely have attempts been made to establish a set of educational precepts which would have such universal validity as hers, and very few others had such a powerful influence on developments in the world as a whole. The all-embracing nature of her ideas is perhaps all the more astonishing in view of the fact that in the initial stages of her research she concentrated on work with very young children, and only later extended it to include older children and the family. She regarded infancy as the critical phase in the evolution of the individual, during which the groundwork for all subsequent development is laid, and hence ascribed universal validity to statements about this period of life. Montessori was also an exemplary figure in that she sought to establish a meeting-ground of theory and practice in the form of the Children's Houses and her didactic materials. No other representative of the New Education put their theories into practice on the same scale; she initiated a varied programme on an international scale that remained without equal.

The truly remarkable thing is that the discussion surrounding her ideas is just as lively and full of controversy today as it was when they were first published. After 1909, when she first appeared in print (at the suggestion of her closest friends, Anna Maccheroni and Alice Franchetti), her works began to be translated into all of the major world languages. The spread of her ideas was aided by a series of stimulating and elegantly articulated lectures held in all parts of the world.

Today the struggle to understand this phenomenon – the relationship between theory and practice, individual and work, what was borrowed and what was original – is as intense as ever, as can be seen by the number of publications in Germany that have dealt with these questions in recent years (Böhm, 1991). A

truly comprehensive assessment was made possible only by the re-issue of her complete works.

This continuing discussion is not motivated at all by a reverent desire to protect and preserve the past, but by a genuine spirit of inquiry. This is so for two reasons. First, the attraction of Montessori's personality, which has survived in her work and gives her ideas a special fascination; second, the intentions behind her work, which were to provide the education of children with a scientifically valid basis and to re-evaluate it constantly by means of practical experiments.

The key experience

Maria Montessori was born in 1870 at Chiaravalle near Ancona, Italy, and died in 1952 at Nordwijk in the Netherlands. In 1896 she became the first woman in Italy to finish medical school with a study on neuropathology. For the following two years she worked as an assistant at the Psychiatric Clinic of the University of Rome; among other things she was responsible for the care of mentally handicapped children. The time spent with these children and the experience of their still intact need and desire to play led her to investigate possibilities for educating them. She discovered the works of the French doctors Bourneville, Itard and Séguin, and of Pereira, a Spaniard who had lived in Paris and known Rousseau and Diderot. She was especially impressed by Itard, who had sought to civilize the wild boy found in the forests of Aveyron by stimulating and developing his senses, and by Itard's pupil, Edouard Séguin. On the whole she revealed little about her sources of inspiration, but in her writings she discussed in depth her efforts to come to terms with Séguin's works, especially with the book *Idiocy: and its Treatment by the Physiological Method,*[2] which appeared after Séguin had emigrated to the United States and in which he described his method for the second time (Montessori, 1969, p. 29).

Inspired by her experiences with the children at the clinic, who had played with pieces of bread on the floor for lack of other toys, and by the exercises for sharpening the sensory functions developed by Séguin, Maria Montessori decided to devote herself to educational problems. In 1900/01 she had a position at the Scuola Magistrale Ortofrenica, an institute responsible for the training of teachers for special schools (for example, for handicapped and mentally retarded children). After a study of education she became involved in the modernization of a Roman slum quarter, San Lorenzo, by assuming responsibility for the education of the children. Her answer to this situation of need was the establishment of a Children's House (Casa dei Bambini), in which the children were to learn about the world and develop the ability to plan their own lives.

San Lorenzo was the beginning of a kind of renaissance movement which served to renew belief in the betterment of mankind by means of the education of children. Although Maria Montessori based her work on scientific principles, she nevertheless considered childhood to be a continuation of the act of creation.

This combination of approaches is the truly fascinating aspect of her work: on the one hand she practised precise experiment and observation in the spirit of science, yet at the same time she regarded faith, hope and trust to be the most effective means of teaching children independence and self-confidence. The Children's Houses that were established in the following years became at times holy places to which educators made pilgrimages – they were always shining examples pointing towards the solution of educational problems.

Reflection and meditation played an important part both in her personal life and in her educational programme. Without getting involved with other approaches and having to submit to compromises, she was sure of her claim to represent the needs of all children, and knew how to put her message across in an intelligent, clear and determined manner. Despite the clarity of her diction she was widely regarded as a kind of high priestess of the rights of children in an antagonistic world. Her individual fate surely contributed to the air of mystery surrounding her work – she gave birth to a son out of wedlock – although through her work she also found a way of resolving this problem in an exemplary fashion (Kramer, 1976, p. 88).

Those closest to Montessori – above all Anna Maccheroni and for a time Helen Parkhurst – were completely dedicated to the task at hand. Her son, and later her grandson, Mario Montessori, also committed themselves to this work. But their commitment had little to do with upholding family tradition; on the contrary, they were concerned with a much broader legacy, the 'education of human beings' (Montessori, 1977).

Montessori and the New Education

The work begun by Maria Montessori in San Lorenzo proved to be enormously fruitful. After being asked by Talamo, the director of a building firm, to establish a youth centre to get the children of working parents off the streets, she created the 'miracle of the new children', who by means of their heightened child-ness influenced their parents favourably in turn. The 'true child' was living proof of the ongoing process of creation, of rebirth and renewal: whoever was ready and able to think the matter through discovered its deeply religious significance.

Maria Montessori was a true exponent of the New Education as an international movement. For her reform was not merely a mechanical process of replacing old methods with supposedly better ones; she was much more concerned with a process more aptly described by the original meaning of *reformatio*: a remodelling and renewal of life.

It is not easy to determine Montessori's position in relation to the rest of the New Education. In contrast to most of the other approaches employed, she was very heavily influenced by Rousseau. Many passages of her books read like variations on themes by Rousseau, and her criticisms of the adult world, which in her opinion gives no consideration to children at all, are also reminiscent of his attitude. Her complaints about wet nurses and the straps, frames, protective

helmets and baskets that were employed to teach children to walk too early were inspired by Rousseau, as was her resultant conclusion: 'It is essential to let nature have its on way as far as possible; the more freedom children are allowed to develop, the quicker and more perfectly they will attain higher forms and functions.'

She definitely had not carried out a systematic study of Rousseau's works – but just as she adopted a great deal of the critical discussion of culture and society of her own day, she must have read at least some parts of *Émile*, above all the first book. Her attitude towards other educators involved in the New Education movement, such as Dewey, Kilpatrick, Decroly and Ferrière, is similarly difficult to ascertain. Although she met many of them in connection with her work in the New Education Fellowship, no real collaboration with them came about. The only ones she even mentioned in her own works were Washburne and Percy Nunn – the latter above all in connection with her concept of 'absorbent mind'.

Percy Nunn, at that time president of the British section of the New Education Fellowship, met her when she gave a series of lectures in London. His ideas of mneme and hormic theory, presented in his book *Education: Its Data and First Principles* (Nunn, 1920), helped her arrive at her view of the constructive function of the developing human mind, which determines the course of life in constant interaction with the environment and in so doing takes on a definite shape itself.

She was also inspired by Ovide Decroly. Their lives and work had much in common: they were almost the same age (Montessori was born in 1870, Decroly in 1871), both studied medicine and both established educational institutions in 1907, the Casa dei Bambini in Rome and École pour la Vie par la Vie in Brussels. Since both of them were active members of the New Education Fellowship they met and had discussions many times.[3] However, at the time of their meeting they had both already developed their concepts for the most part, so that the great similarity of their approaches was primarily due to their having both studied the works of Itard and Séguin.

The basic concept behind Montessori's educational work was that of providing children with a suitable environment in which to live and learn. The significant thing about her educational programme is that it gave equal emphasis to internal and external development, arranged so that they complemented one another. But the fact that external education was even given consideration, having been considered merely a consequence of the success of internal education by the idealistic schools of philosophy and education, bears witness to the scientific orientation of the programme. Here Séguin's influence must have been decisive, as well as that of Pereira, who had established the role of the senses in the development of the personality. The idea that it is possible to form and alter human beings exclusively by means of manipulating their sensory input, which Diderot discussed in his *Lettres sur les aveugles* and *Lettres sur les muets*, and

which inspired Rousseau's programme for training the senses, also played an important part in Montessori's theories.

The truly original nature of Montessori's ideas can only be grasped if they are compared with the method developed by the Agazzi sisters. The work of Rosa and Carolina Agazzi was one of the most remarkable attempts to make progress in the education of young children. It is important to us today because it occurred within the same environment in which Montessori developed her ideas. As early as 1882 Rosa Agazzi and her sister took over a home (Il Nuovo Asilo) in Monpiano, Brescia, which is considered to be the first Children's House in Italy (Pasquali, 1903). Just as Montessori did later, Rosa Agazzi also sought to intensify and control the education of young children by means of altering their living environment (Agazzi, 1932).

Montessori introduced the education process by means of a set of standardized learning materials; Rosa Agazzi, on the other hand, insisted that objects collected by the children themselves carry out this function. In this way the objects were to be experienced more thoroughly and the process of abstraction only introduced after this first stage had been absolved. However, it would be incorrect to state that the difference between the two approaches was that the Agazzi sisters encouraged direct experience and Montessori abstraction; Montessori was also very much concerned with the experiential stage. She nevertheless placed greater emphasis on introducing the process of comparison and abstraction, which is of paramount importance for intellectual development, in a controlled and intelligently planned manner, so that it would not be left to chance.

Like other New Educators, Montessori was aware of the fact that it is necessary to take the inclinations and interests of the children themselves as the starting-point if the educational process is to remain relatively free of conflicts. But she also recognized that these inclinations and interests must be encouraged and deepened by means of exercises, and further that the success of this is dependent on awakening a feeling of responsibility in the children. This was her truly original contribution: she not only gave consideration to the inclinations and interests of the children, as was done by many New Educators who based their work solely on this principle, but also sought to encourage responsibility and self-discipline on the part of the children.

The Children's Houses

The Children's Houses were living environments specially adapted to children, in which they could grow and develop in keeping with their individual sense of responsibility. In the houses everything was adapted to the children and their specific attitudes and perspectives: not only cupboards, tables and chairs but also colour, sound and architecture. The children were expected to live and move in this environment in a responsible way and deal with the tasks of creating and

keeping order so that they could ascend a kind of 'ladder' towards self-realization.

Freedom and discipline interacted, and the basic tenet was that neither one could be achieved without the other. Seen in this way, discipline was not something imposed from the outside but rather a challenge to become worthy of freedom. In this connection Montessori wrote: 'We call someone disciplined if he is his own master and can therefore command himself to behave properly if a rule of life must be observed' (Montessori, 1969, p. 57).

The idea central to self-determination, namely that freedom is possible only if one submits to laws that one has discovered and decided upon oneself, which Rousseau formulated in terms of his *volonté générale*, was not expressly stated in her works. Around the turn of the century Italian philosophy was dominated by positivistic thought, to be sure, but idealistic and neo-Kantian tendencies were also represented by Alessandro Chiapelli, Bernardino Varisco and Benedetto Croce. It is not very likely that Montessori studied these philosophers to any great extent; nevertheless, she had her children participate actively in the shaping of their living environment, as well as its rules and principles of order, and in this way justice was thoroughly done to the idea of moral autonomy.

But Montessori went even further: she systematically developed the logical sequel of these ideas, namely, their application and practice in real-life situations, an aspect that has often been passed over too lightly by educators. The programme she developed to do this involved 'exercises in daily living', or '*exercices de la vie pratique*', as she called them in the first of her lectures held in France (Montessori, 1976, p. 105). These included exercises in patience, exactness and repetition, all of which were intended to strengthen the powers of concentration. It was important that these exercises be done each day within the context of some real 'task' and not as mere games or busy work. They were rounded out by practice in being still and meditating, which formed the point of transition from 'external' to 'internal' education.

In her writings Montessori repeatedly stressed the importance of developing attitudes instead of just practical abilities; she wrote that practical work should result in an attitude by means of contemplation: 'disciplined behaviour becomes a basic attitude'.

For her this was the real task of the Children's Houses:

> The central feature of this development of the personality was free work which satisfies the natural needs of inner life. Therefore free *intellectual* work shows itself to be the basis of inner discipline. The principal achievement of the Children's Houses has been to instil discipline in the children [Montessori, 1976, p. 107].

This statement was then given force by a comparison with religious education:

> This reminds one of the advice given by the Catholic Church for maintaining intellectual and spiritual strength, i.e. after a period of 'inward concentration' one can attain to 'moral strength'. The moral personality must take its stabilizing strength from methodical 'meditation'; without this strength the 'inner being' remains scattered and unbalanced, is

not its own master and cannot utilize its own powers for noble ends [Montessori, 1976, p. 104].

In common with Rousseau, Montessori considered 'help for the weak, the aged and the infirm' to be an important task to be carried out during the stage of personal development in which 'moral relationships' (Montessori, 1966, p. 33) define and mark the beginning of a new life as a moral individual. She thought that the proper time for this step was during adolescence, but in the Children's Houses it was prepared for in a number of different ways. The earliest activities engaged in by the children were thus of decisive importance morally and physically for their entire subsequent development.

The sensitive phase contained in early childhood is a unique opportunity to encourage positive development, which must be taken advantage of. Montessori considered social training to be an important part of this early phase since self-determination must take its orientation from others if the individual is to attain perfection as a social being. In the final chapter of her book *The Discovery of the Child* she described this process:

> No child is disturbed by what another may have attained; on the contrary, the triumph of one causes admiration and joy in the others, and they often imitate him full of goodwill. All of the children seem to be happy and contented doing 'what they can'; what the others do does not result in envy, embarrassing competition or vanity. A three-year-old can work peacefully next to a seven-year-old, and the younger child is content to be smaller than the older child, not envying him because of his greater size. They all grow in the midst of the most perfect peace [Montessori, 1969, p. 33].

The didactic materials were also intended to aid this growing in the most perfect peace in order to attain a highly developed sense of responsibility. Constituting a part of the 'prepared environment' in the Children's Houses, they were methodically planned and standardized so that a child who freely chose to occupy himself with one of them would enter into a predetermined situation and be forced unwittingly to deal with its intellectual purpose. The best example of this is the cylinders of different lengths and sizes which were to be inserted into appropriate holes; only one solution was possible for each cylinder and the child could grasp the fact of an incorrect solution when the cylinder slipped off and could not be inserted.

The didactic materials

A basic principle of the didactic materials was that the activities should be methodically co-ordinated so that the children could easily judge the degree of their success while engaging in them. For instance, in one activity the children practised walking along large circles laid on the ground in a variety of interesting patterns. While doing so they were given a bowl to hold filled to the brim with blue or red ink; if it ran over then they could recognize in this way that their

movements were not co-ordinated and graceful enough. In a similar way all the bodily functions were consciously trained.

For each of the senses there was an exercise that could be made even more effective by eliminating other senses. For example, an exercise involving the identification of different kinds of wood by feeling their grain could be intensified by covering the eyes.

By being done and discussed together within the context of the group, the relevance of these exercises for the social aspects of the children's education was increased. Thus, the various activities were intended to interact, or, as Montessori expressed it, 'practical and social life must be profoundly combined in education' (Montessori, 1972, p. 38).

If it was true of Helen Parkhurst, then it was doubly so of Maria Montessori, her teacher: she sought to develop the social aspects of education, although she gave her work a different emphasis than was to be found in certain sociologically based educational concepts which dealt with a different set of problems.[4] This fact is mentioned in reply to those who one-sidedly dismiss the educational ideas of Helen Parkhurst and Maria Montessori as being hopelessly individualistic.

The didactic materials were to function 'like a ladder', as Montessori expressed it many times, which would allow the children to take the initiative themselves and progress towards self-realization. At the same time the materials were permeated with a particular spirit and intellectual attitude, which would be communicated to the children and mould them accordingly.

> Thus, the sensory materials should definitely be regarded as 'materialized abstraction'. . . . When the child is directly confronted with the materials he applies himself to them with that kind of earnest, concentrated attention which seems to draw the best out of his consciousness. It really seems as if the little ones were involved in doing the best work their minds are capable of: the materials open new doors to their understanding which otherwise would remain locked [Montessori, 1969, p. 197-98].

Using this approach, the teacher can withdraw from the centre of the educational process and operate from its periphery. His most important task is to observe in a scientific manner and employ his intuition in discovering new possibilities and needs. The development of the children should be directed in a responsible way in keeping with the spirit of science.

The scientific basis of her work

Montessori was among the first to try and establish a true science of education. Her approach was to introduce the 'science of observation' (Montessori, 1976, p. 125). She demanded that the teachers and other persons engaged in education be given training in these methods and that the educational process itself be given a framework which would allow scientific controls and checks. 'The possibility of observing the mental development of children as natural phenomena and

under experimental conditions converts *the school itself* in activity, to a type of scientific environment devoted to the psychogenetic study of man' (Montessori, 1976, p. 120).

The basic art of precise observation, which had been acclaimed much earlier by Rousseau as the most important qualification for educators, includes precise perception and description. Montessori envisioned a 'new type of teacher': 'Instead of talking he must learn to be silent; instead of instructing he must observe; instead of presenting the proud dignity of one who desires to appear infallible he must don the robe of humility' (Montessori, 1976, p. 123). This kind of dedicated observation from a distance is not a natural ability; it must be learned,

> and this process is a true introduction to science. If something is not consciously seen, it is as if it had never existed. The *scientist's soul* is filled with passionate interest for that which he sees. When one has learned to see he begins to be interested. And this interest is the driving force behind the spirit of science [Montessori, 1976, p. 125].

Montessori envisioned a procedure which today would be described as hermeneutic-empirical. Nevertheless, she herself did not succeed in putting any of these ideas into practice in any thorough manner in her own work. Her experiments neither possessed a solid theoretical framework nor were they carried out and evaluated in a way that would allow them to be objectively confirmed. Her descriptions were not free of subjective impressions and her conclusions were often biased in her own favour or even dogmatically phrased.

Despite this, she was extremely good at constructing educational situations, although they were often certainly more the expression of her inspiring personality than the result of careful thought and planning. Her observations were conducted in a careful manner and involved a number of scientific procedures for ensuring objectivity, but basically she was possessed of a very personal and unique talent for dealing with and interpreting educational processes.

Her descriptions of educational phenomena and the conclusions she drew from them should be understood in this light. A little girl who attempts to find the right hole for a peg forty-four times before happily turning her attention elsewhere is described; but neither her intellectual and social background nor her subsequent progress is mentioned. Montessori dealt in a similar way with all manner of phenomena, awakenings and 'explosions'. If she is judged by her own standards for scientific and theoretical work in education – even though she formulated them in a vague and generalized way – then she hardly passes the test. The success of her work was due to other factors: her humility and patience and her (often mentioned) fascination with the wonder of life.

This imaginative ability, which goes above and beyond precise observation, is actually a philosophical way of life. Despite all her criticism of philosophy and philosophical education, she adopted the same attitude herself. In a passage discussing the necessity of training teachers in connection with practical educational experience, she wrote the following about students of biology and medicine and

the role of the microscope: 'While engaged in observations with the aid of the microscope they felt that fascination towards the wonder of life growing within them which causes the mind to awaken and devote itself to the mysteries of life with passionate enthusiasm' (Montessori, 1976, p. 133).

It is important to consider Montessori's sensitive openness to the 'mysteries of life' alongside her basically scientific approach. Failing to take both aspects into account, one is bound to become entangled in contradictions and to continue the still-flourishing controversy as to the value and meaning of her work, although, even if everything were taken into consideration, all of the differences of opinion would hardly be resolved.

Some of Maria Montessori's statements and conclusions sound more like Pestalozzi in one of his philosophical moments than the objective analysis of a doctor of medicine. But it has been precisely her broad approach that has lent much of her writing prophetic force, although it also tends towards ambiguity at times, and this accounts for her great popularity around the world, in India as much as in Europe. Her influence was greatest wherever she personally appeared and gave lectures and courses and gained a dedicated group of followers willing to experiment and continue the spirit of her work (Schultz-Benisch, 1962; Böhm, 1991, p. 15).

Perception

Maria Montessori not only worked out a systematic method for developing the perceptive faculties, but also evolved a theory of perception that has much in common with Pestalozzi's approach. Thus, in reference to the didactic materials, she warns that 'the attention of the children should not be chained to the objects in question after the delicate process of abstraction has begun' (Montessori, 1976, p. 80). She intended her didactic materials to be so constructed that they would point the way beyond the immediate situation at hand and promote abstraction. If these materials do not encourage generalization they could tie the children down to the earth with 'snares'. If this occurs then the child remains 'trapped within the realm of useless objects'.

> In the world as a whole, more or less the same basic ideas repeat themselves again and again. For example, if the life of plants or insects is studied in nature, then an approximate idea of the life of plants and insects in the whole world is obtained. Nobody is familiar with *all* plants. It is enough to see one pine tree in order to imagine how all pine trees are [Montessori, 1976, p. 80].

Pursuing the same idea she wrote elsewhere: 'Is it necessary, when one is confronted with a river or a lake, to have seen all of the rivers and lakes in the world to know what it is?' The idea expressed here, as well as the way in which it is formulated, are in surprisingly close agreement with Pestalozzi. And just as he had, she warned against neglecting the forms of direct perception. 'No description, no

picture, no book can replace the real life of trees in the context of all the life which surrounds them in the forest' (Montessori, 1966, p. 40).

She considered it of fundamental importance that 'the co-operation of inner attention' be gained. For this reason she sought to structure the motivational basis of the didactic materials in such a way that they would make contact with the sphere of consciousness of the child. It is notable that Montessori explained this process in terms of an act of faith, a related process which, however, takes place on another level: 'It is not enough . . . to *see in order to believe; one must believe in order to see.*' And elsewhere she wrote: 'It is in vain that one explains or *demonstrates* a fact, even if it is an extraordinary one, if there is no faith: the realization of truth is not made possible by evidence but by an act of faith' (Montessori, 1966, p. 216). There can be no doubt that she succeeded in linking this form of faith as inner knowledge and improved vision with her concept of science.

Self-realization through independent activity

One of the key concepts of Montessori's education system is 'independent activity'. 'A person is what he is, not because of the teachers he has had, but as a result of that which he has done himself.' In another context she even introduced the idea of 'self-creation'. She applied this not only to sensory perception and the intellect but also to the co-ordination of all the facets of humanness involved in the development of the personality.

This process can only be successful if it takes place in freedom, whereby freedom is understood as going hand in hand with discipline and responsibility. Children possess an intuitive understanding of the forms of self-realization by means of independent activity.

> Children seem to 'feel' their inner growth, to be conscious of the achievements which mark and define their growth. Outwardly they appear happier as they become aware that a process of growth towards something higher and greater has begun within them [Montessori, 1976, p. 92].

In most of the examples Montessori added in this context she spoke of the high degree of satisfaction shown by the children as a result of their independently achieved self-realization. She came to the conclusion that 'this growing self-awareness promotes maturity. Give a child a feeling of its own worth and it will feel free and no longer burdened by its work' (Montessori, 1966, p. 40).

Seen in this way, freedom must be first renounced and then won back gradually by means of self-realization. All individuals are dependent on one another and can therefore progress to self-realization only within the context of this interdependence. This process is accompanied by full awareness and requires that all one's faculties be engaged, strengthening them at the same time. This self-realization ultimately leads to self-education (*autoeducatione*) which is the real goal. Therefore reflection, meditative concentration yet, at the same time, intense

effort are indispensable when attempting to solve the problems posed by the didactic materials.

At this point we have already arrived at what Montessori meant by the 'absorbent mind', one of the key concepts of her education system, alongside that of 'normalization'. In keeping with her medically oriented terminology she referred to children as 'intellectual embryos'. In this way she emphasized the fact that children are involved in a process of development, as well as the parallel nature of intellectual and physical development. From the beginning children are beings equipped with minds. Nevertheless, during the first stage of development following birth the physical aspect predominates, although these basic needs can only be properly satisfied if the intellectual being at their root is recognized and accepted. 'In other words, children must be cared for right from birth, giving attention above all to the fact that they are beings with a mental life of their own' (Montessori, 1972, p. 61).

The education of children must be conducted in a balanced manner right from the start; otherwise the first impressions will produce distorted or biased forms of understanding, expectations and behaviour which then perpetuate themselves. The first impressions are not only permanently engraved in the children's minds; developmental structures also develop as a result of them, patterns according to which all subsequent experiences are dealt with and assimilated.

Right from birth children are naturally open to the world. For this very reason they are also in constant danger of losing their way, unlike animals, which have such a store of instinctual responses that a proper course of development is ensured; on the other hand animals are not free, since freedom is not a natural state but a condition that must be attained. 'Unlike animals, human beings are not naturally programmed with any co-ordinated sets of movements. They must learn everything themselves: they have no goals given them, but must search for them' (Montessori, 1972, p. 67). In this respect there is some similarity between Montessori's ideas and modern anthropology. Her book *Anthropologia pedagogica* (1910) was the first of her works to be devoted to questions of this sort.

When she speaks of 'psycho-embryonic life' she is utilizing an analogy with the 'physical embryo' in order to emphasize that one's intellectual world must also be built up gradually by means of impressions and experiences. One's environment and its organization as regards its educational function is therefore just as important as bodily nourishment is during the pre-natal phase.

> The first task of education is to provide the child with an environment in which it is able to develop its natural functions. This does not mean that one should merely satisfy the child's needs and allow it to do what it likes; we must also be prepared to co-operate with a command of nature, with one of its laws, according to which development and growth proceed by means of interaction with the environment [Montessori, 1972, p. 82].

The 'absorbent mind' is at the same time ability and willingness to learn. It means that the mind is directed towards the events in the surrounding world and in phase with them, so that out of the existing great variety those aspects which

prove to have educational value are different in each individual case: 'in all ways mental development is the first step in the adventure of life' (Montessori, 1972, p. 69). The important thing is that the impressions received and mental openness match one another, so that the demands placed by the learning process correspond to the natural sensitivities and tendencies of each phase of development.

Closely related to these anthropological concepts is the idea of 'sensitive phases'. The sensitive phases are periods of heightened receptivity in connection with learning by means of interaction with the environment. According to this theory there exist specific phases during which the child is naturally receptive to certain environmental influences; these he must make use of in order to master certain innate functions and achieve greater maturity. Thus there are sensitive phases for learning to speak, mastering social interactions, etc. If these phases are given proper consideration they can be exploited to promote periods of intense and efficient learning. If they are not taken advantage of then the opportunities are irretrievably lost.

The harmonious progress of inner and outer development can also result in increasing independence: 'If no regressive syndromes manifest themselves the child will show tendencies which are clearly and energetically directed towards functional independence. . . . Within each individual a vital force is active which directs him towards realization of self. Percy Nunn called this force *Horme*' (Montessori, 1952, p. 77).

This is also the reason why Montessori expected so much from an educational reform in accordance with her ideas. For her the child was a promise and a starting-point for the education of the 'new man'. Her expectations were so high that she genuinely expected salvation to come in that way. She also believed in renewal and the attainment of perfection:

> If salvation arrives then it will begin with the children, since the children are the creators of mankind. The children have been vested with unknown powers which could lead the way to a better future. If a genuine renewal is to be sought after at all, then the development of man's potential must be the task of education [Montessori, 1952, p. 52].

This faith in man's potential, which is increased by means of the 'absorbent mind' when the correct educational methods are employed, is one of the cornerstones of Montessori's theory of education. The second important aspect is the attempt to mould this process in a spirit of scientific responsibility and to discover the weaknesses and turning points of human development in order to direct it better. The process is not conceived as being linear but rather dynamic, exploding with awakenings, enlightenments, transformations and creative syntheses which lift it up to new heights of evolution, the nature of which cannot even be guessed at. She wrote: 'Development is a series of successive births' (Montessori, 1952, p. 16).

In this sense her own life and the development of her ideas were dependent on encounters, inspirations and rebirths; encounters with others of like mind were often much more important than involvement with established theories.

The great productivity of her work was in the last analysis due to the effects of the hormic principle in her life and thought. She sought to influence the world in a controlled way through the harmonious combination of theory and practice; she looked for the confirmation of her theories in practice and shaped her practice according to scientific principles, thus achieving perfection: that is why Maria Montessori's educational concept has been so successful.

Notes

1. This article is a translation of a chapter from my books *Die Reformpädagogik: Ursprung und Verlauf unter internationalem Aspekt* [Pedagogical Reform: Origins and Evolution from an International Viewpoint], 3rd ed., p. 225-41, Weinheim, 1991; and *Die Reformpädagogik und ihre Perpektiven für eine Bildungsreform* [Pedagogical Reform and its Prospects for an Educational Reform], pp. 61-80, Donauwörth, 1991.
2. Her relationship to her teacher Séguin is dealt with in depth in Rita Kramer, *Maria Montessori: A Biography*. New York, 1976; as well as in T. Hellbrügge, *Unser Montessori-Modell*, Munich, 1977, pp. 68 et seq.; and W. Böhm, *Maria Montessori: Hintergrund und Prinzipien ihres pädagogischen Denkens* [Background and Principles of her Educational Thinking], Bad Heilbrunn/Obb. 1991.
3. This supposition would probably be supported by an investigation and publication of her correspondence, something that has not yet been done.
4. I have dealt with this matter in my article, 'Maria Montessori und die Progressive Education in den USA' [Maria Montessori and Progressive Education in th USA], in A. Pehnke (ed.), *Ein Plädoyer für unser reformpädagogisches Erbe* [A Plea for the Heritage of Our Educational Reform], pp. 65-78, Neuwied, 1992. It has also been dealt with in Bohm, op. cit., p. 86.

References

Agazzi, R. 1932. *Guida per le educatrice dell'infanzia* [Guide for the Educator of Children]. Brescia.

Böhm, W. 1991. *Maria Montessori. Hintergrund und Prinzipien ihres pädagogischen Denkens* [Maria Montessori: Background and Principles of her Educational Thinking]. 2nd. ed. Bad Heilbrunn.

Kramer, R. 1976. *Maria Montessori: A Biography*. New York.

Montessori, M. 1952. *Kinder sind anders* [Children Are Different]. Stuttgart.

——. 1966. *Von der Kindheit zur Jugend* [From Childhood to Adolescence]. (Edited by P. Oswald.) Freiburg.

——. 1969. *Die Entdeckung des Kindes* [The Discovery of the Child]. (Edited by P. Oswald and G. Schulz-Benesch.) Freiburg.

——. 1972. *Das kreative Kind* [The Creative Child]. Freiburg.

——. 1976. *Schule des Kindes* [The School for Children]. Freiburg.

Montessori, M. M. 1977. *Erziehung zum Menschen* [The Education of Man]. Munich.

Nunn, P. 1920. *Education: Its Data and First Principles*. London.

Pasquali, P. 1903. *Il nuevo asilo* [The New Kindergarten]. Brescia.

Schulz-Benesch, G. 1962. *Der Streit um Montessori: Kritische Nachforschungen zum Werk einer katholischen Pädagogin von Weltruf mit einer internationalen*

Montessori-Bibliographie [The Dispute about Montessori: A Critical Investigation of the Work of a World-famous Catholic Female Educator with an International Bibliography on Montessori]. 2nd ed. Freiburg.

Works by Maria Montessori

L'Autoeducazione nelle scuole elementari [Self-education in the Primary School]. Garzanti, 1962.

Bambini viventi nella Chiesa [Children Living in the Church]. Garzanti, 1970.

Dall'infanzia all'adolescenza. Garzanti, 1970. (*From Childhood to Adolescence*. 2nd ed. New York, Schocken Books, 1976.)

Il Segreto dell'infanzia. Garzanti, 1970. (*The Secret of Childhood*. Bombay, Orient Longman, 1982.)

Educazione e pace. Garzanti, 1970. (*Education and Peace*. Chicago, Regnery, 1972.)

Formazione dell'uomo. Garzanti, 1972. (*Childhood Education*. New York, N.Y., New American Library, 1975.)

La Mente del bambino [The Mind of the Child]. Garzanti, 1975.

La Scoperta del bambino. Garzanti, 1980. (*The Discovery of the Child*. New York, Ballantine Books, 1974.)

Educazione all libertà [Education for Liberty]. Laterza, 1986.

Works about Maria Montessori

Fuchs, B.; Harth-Peter, W. (eds.). *Montessori-Pädagogik und die Erziehungsprobleme der Gegenwart* [Montessori's Pedagogy and Today's Educational Problems]. Wurzburg, 1989.

Hellbrügge, T. (ed.). *Die Montessori-Pädagogik und das behinderte Kind* [Montessori's Pedagogy and the Backward Child]. München, 1977.

Holtstiege, *H. Erzieher in der Montessori-Pädagogik* [Teachers in Montessori's Pedagogy]. Freiburg/Basle/Vienna, 1991.

Oswald, P.; Schulz-Benisch, G. (eds.). *Montessori für Eltern* [Montessori for Parents]. Ravensburg, 1974.

Scheid, P.; Weidlich, H. (eds.). *Beiträge sur Montessori-Pädagogik* [Contributions to Montessori's Pedagogy]. Stuttgart, 1977.

Scocchera, A. *Maria Montessori: Quasi un rittratto in edito* [Maria Montessori: Almost a Portrait in Print]. Florence, 1992.

SIR THOMAS MORE

(1478–1535)

Keith Watson

Sir Thomas More, or more accurately St Thomas More, since he was beatified by the Roman Catholic Church in 1886 and canonized as a saint in 1935, has been variously described as 'the most attractive figure of the early sixteenth century',[1] 'the voice of conscience' of the early English Reformation[2] and 'one of the three greatest figures of the English Renaissance'.[3] He was a scholar, lawyer, theologian, statesman and eventual martyr, whose influence was less on the development of the Reformation in England as upon creating a particular genre of futuristic and idealistic writing about society. His most famous book, *Utopia*, has come to be accepted as an everyday term in the English language and 'utopian' is often used to refer to an idea or concept that is idealistic and highly desirable, but which at the same time is completely impracticable and unrealistic. In terms of political science, both liberals and socialists lay claim to Thomas More as a founder of some of their ideas. There has even been a room in the Kremlin devoted to Thomas More because of his apparent espousal of communism as a political ideal.[4]

He was born into a period of intense political and social turmoil in English history as the House of York was overthrown by Henry Tudor in 1485 and as a new, ruthless dynasty was established, a dynasty that was to have a profound influence not only on the future shape of Church/state relations, and consequently on the development of parliamentary democracy in England and Wales, but above all on the future development of the Reformation in England. It is generally as a political theorist and opponent of King Henry VIII in his attempt to supersede the Pope as head of the Church in England that Thomas More is best remembered. As a result, his contribution to educational thought in sixteenth-century England and Europe is often overlooked. This profile seeks to redress that balance and to show that More was as much a farsighted visionary as he was a critic of contemporary society.

The context of More's life

To understand the importance and stature of Thomas More and why he is still venerated as a man of outstanding courage and integrity, it is necessary to appreciate something of the political and historical context of his life. For much of the fifteenth century England was in a state of political turmoil as the Houses of York and Lancaster fought, with different nobles lined up on both sides for political supremacy. Henry IV (1399-1413) deposed Richard II and became the first of the Lancastrian rulers. His son Henry V (1413-22), immortalized by Shakespeare in his play of that name, defeated the French at the battle of Agincourt (1415), became regent of France and heir to the French throne. Unfortunately, his son Henry VI (1422-61) was more interested in religion and asceticism than in political and military warfare. While Henry VI's legacy is Eton College and King's College, Cambridge, his political legacy was less prestigious. He lost the French possessions and eventually the Wars of the Roses,[5] leaving the Yorkist Edward IV (1461-83) on the throne. Although his son, Edward V, was named king, his position was usurped by his uncle, the Duke of York, who became King Richard III (1483-85). Even so his position was far from secure, partly because of uncertainty about what happened to the young princes, Edward V and his brother Richard.[6] When Richard III was defeated at the battle of Bosworth in 1485 by Henry Tudor (Henry VII, 1485-1509), whose claims to the English throne were also pretty tenuous, a new era broke out in English history. Henry VII secured his position by ruthless suppression of potential rivals, by shrewd treaties with neighbouring European countries and by fiscal austerity. His son, Henry VIII (1509-45), not only consolidated the Tudor dynasty by dynastic and other treaties, by ruthless suppression of critics, but he also embarked on a number of foreign wars which severely strained the English Exchequer. The result was not only rampant inflation and considerable social unrest, but periodic requests for additional taxation to be levied by Parliament. In 1509 Henry had married Catherine of Aragon, widow of his elder brother, Arthur. Unfortunately, she was unable to provide Henry with the son he so desperately needed to secure the dynasty through the male line.[7] Unable to get a divorce from the Pope on the grounds that he should never have married his brother's wife, the argument being that this was adulterous (Leviticus 20:10), Henry came into conflict with the Roman Catholic Church. A solution to the impasse was suggested by his then secretary, Thomas Cromwell (1485-1540): if he could only make himself, instead of the Pope, Head of the Church in England, Henry could easily grant himself the divorce he required. The Act of Supremacy of 1531 did precisely that. Subsequent legislation was to launch the Reformation of the Church in England which was finally consolidated in the reign of one of Henry VIII's daughters, Elizabeth I (1558-1603). It was over the issue of the King's divorce and Henry's claim to be Supreme Head of the Church that the conflict arose between Henry and Thomas More, leading ultimately to the latter's execution in 1535. However, More was not beheaded because of the stand he took on reli-

gious issues directly, but because of treason. Refusal to accept the Act of Supremacy was a treasonable offence, as Henry was at pains to point out subsequently to the Pope and to the Habsburg Emperor, Charles V, who, according to William Roper, More's son-in-law, said to the English Ambassador, Sir Thomas Eliot:

> 'My Lord Ambassador, we understand that the King your Master, hath put his faithful servant and grave wise councillor Sir Thomas More to death.' Whereunto Sir Thomas Eliot answered, that he understood nothing thereof. 'Well', said the Emperor, 'it is very true, and this will we say, that if we had been master of such a servant, of whose doings ourselves have had these many years no small experience, we would rather have lost the best city of our dominions, than have lost such a worthy councillor.'[8]

It is a measure of the antagonism of so many leading officials against the corrupt state of the Church in the early sixteenth century that Henry was able to push through so much anti-clerical legislation in the 1530s and 1540s including the dissolution of the great monasteries and chantry houses. There had been considerable criticisms of the corrupt practices of the clergy; that they often had mistresses; that they exploited the poor and the gullible; that their influence on education was dull and sterile. Leading critics of this state of affairs were men like Erasmus (1466-1536)[9] and Thomas More. However, while both wanted reform of the Church, unlike Luther in Germany and Zwingli in Switzerland, they did not seek to break from the Roman Catholic Church. They wanted reform from within. Indeed, More feared that the excesses of Luther would lead to social upheaval and civil war. In many ways, while More was a Renaissance man and was keen on new ideas and new thinking, and while he welcomed the new horizons opened up by a study of the Greek and Latin classics, he was at heart a conservative in terms of spiritual and even political control. Above all, he was a man of the utmost honesty and integrity.

Life and history of Thomas More

Thomas More was born on 6 February 1478, in London, the son of John More (died 1530), a member of the legal profession. It has sometimes been suggested that his father was a judge, but it is more likely that he was a legal attorney. Certainly he influenced Thomas's thinking about the law. Thomas was educated at St Antony's School, then the best in London, before being sent at the age of about 12 to live in the household of John, Cardinal Morton, Archbishop of Canterbury and Lord Chancellor of England. More was obviously profoundly influenced by Morton, whom he praises in his *History of King Richard III* and indirectly praises in his *Utopia*. For his part, Morton sent the young More to Canterbury College (later Christ Church College), Oxford, in 1492 to study law. While at Oxford More studied under Linacre (1460-1524), one of the leading Renaissance humanists of the time. He was both a classical scholar, tutor to Henry VII's eldest son, Prince Arthur, as well as a physician who later founded

and became the first President of the Royal College of Physicians (1518). Linacre, after whom an Oxford College was later named, taught More and a fellow student, Erasmus, Latin and Greek, and an enthusiasm for what was then known as the New Learning, subsequently referred to as the Renaissance, a broad intellectual interest in the classics, the humanities, literature, poetry and music. John Colet (1467-1519) was also lecturing at Oxford at the time. He shared many of the new Renaissance ideas, though his influence on More was through his theological writings and preaching. He attacked many of the current ecclesiastical abuses and scholastic views about the teachings of St Paul, seeking to open up a new form of biblical scholarship based on the original Greek texts.

On leaving Oxford More completed his legal studies at the Inns of Court in London, first at New Inn, then at Lincoln's Inn, before becoming a reader at Furnival's Inn. He obviously had a sharp legal mind for he was much sought after and was clearly destined for higher things.

For a brief period he contemplated becoming a priest. From 1501 to 1504 he stayed with the Carthusian monks in the Charterhouse in London in 'devotion and prayer'. It was here that he began to wear a horsehair shirt as a form of penance. He only removed it on the day before his execution over thirty years later! Erasmus said of More that he left the Charterhouse and abandoned his religious vocation because he would rather be 'a chaste husband than an impure priest' – and because he was in love. According to Cotterill,[10] it was also because of what he regarded as the gross caricature of Christianity as presented by the Church and because Pico di Mirandola, whom More greatly admired, had also refused to become a monk.

Whatever the real reason – and there may have been several – More wooed and married Jane Colt of Netherhall, Sussex, in 1504.[11] During the next five years she bore him four children, three daughters and a son. The eldest daughter, Margaret, was also his favourite and it is through her husband William Roper's work *The Life of Sir Thomas More*, which first appeared in 1553, that we have such a detailed portrait of the man and his career. His first wife died in 1511 and, realizing that his children needed a mother figure, he quickly remarried a widow, Alice Middleton, seven years his senior. Despite being short tempered and sharp tongued, she proved an excellent mother for the children and a bulwark for the family, an institution greatly favoured by More. Indeed, from the picture Erasmus painted through his letters, More had an exceedingly happy family life in which he not only enjoyed his children's company, but sought to develop their thinking and intellectual skills.[12] In one letter to his daughter Margaret, who kissed him just prior to his death and who kept his head until her own death, More wrote, 'I assure you that rather than allow my children to grow up ignorant and idle I would sacrifice all, and bid farewell to business in order to attend them – among whom none is more dear to me than you, my beloved daughter.'[13]

More was a remarkable man in many ways, not only because he lived a fulfilling public and professional life, not only because interspersed with his public duties he was a prodigious writer in both Latin and English, but because he was

able to maintain a family life in which he put into practice many of the educational ideas in his 'Academy' (i.e. his household). It is because of this interweaving of both public and private aspects of life that it is not always easy to unravel the man and his ideas from the official positions he held. Nor is it always easy to unravel Thomas More from Erasmus, Europe's most famous man of letters of the early sixteenth century. From 1499, or thereabouts, they became firm friends and Erasmus was to become a frequent visitor at More's home during the next twenty years. In 1506, for example, they translated Lucian's works, one of which, *Mennipus Goes to Hell*, must have given More some inspiration for his own *Utopia*. In 1509, while staying with More, Erasmus wrote his famous *Ecomium moriae* [In Praise of Folly], while in 1518 he printed More's Latin poems because he believed that 'England's only genius' had not enough time to do so himself, let alone write all the creative works that he wished. This was partly because More's legal and political career were encroaching upon his thinking time. In the last year of Henry VII's reign, 1509, More became a Member of Parliament and under-sheriff of London. He was soon introduced by Cardinal Wolsey to the new king, Henry VIII. Thereafter, More had a rapid elevation to senior political positions. In 1514 he was made Master of the Requests. The following year, he was sent on the first of several foreign missions. This one was a commercial embassy to Flanders, during which time he wrote the second book of *Utopia*, completing the first book on his return to England later in the year. Other foreign missions using More's diplomatic skills included attendance in Calais (1520) following the meeting of Henry VIII with Charles V and Francis I at the Field of the Cloth of Gold,[14] embassies to Bruges and Calais (1521), an embassy to Paris (1527) with Cardinal Wolsey, and a representative of the King at the Treaty of Cambrai (1529), which kept England out of a continental war for the next thirteen years.

Political honours were also showered upon him. Having successfully defended a group of London apprentices who had rioted in 1517 he was, the following year, on Wolsey's recommendation, made a Privy Councillor. In 1521, he was knighted and became Treasurer of the Exchequer. In 1523 he was elected Speaker of the House of Commons. It is said that on appointment he told Wolsey that he could not and would not do anything simply to please himself for he had 'neither eyes to see nor ears to hear but as this House [of Commons] shall direct me whose servant I am'.[15] He was subsequently elected High Steward of Oxford University (1524), High Steward of Cambridge University (1525), made Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster (1525) and in 1529, on the downfall of Wolsey, he reluctantly became the King's most senior and respected adviser when he was appointed Lord High Chancellor, the first layman to hold this great office of state. In human terms this was the pinnacle of his career.

Up to this point More's fame rested as much upon his prolific writings and his theological discourses as upon his virtues as a man of integrity, honesty and simplicity. Apart from his joint work with Erasmus, previously mentioned, numerous Latin poems, and *Utopia*, he wrote several letters of scholarly controversy, for example, to Marin Dorp (1515); to the university authorities in Oxford

(1518) in which he brilliantly argued for the place of humanistic learning in the university, especially Greek and what would now be called 'liberal arts' subjects; and 'to a monk' (1520), in which he criticized the corruption of the clergy. In 1520 he helped Henry VIII to compose *Assertio septem sacramentorum*, an attack on Luther and all he stood for, which earned for Henry the title Defender of the Faith from Pope Leo X.[16] When Luther responded, Henry delegated More to reply, which he did with his *Responsio ad Lutherum* (1523). In 1522 he began a devotional treatise, *The Four Last Things*, a meditation on death, doom, pain and joy. It was never finished, but it reflected More's despondency at the cruel and vindictive political and economic conditions of early Tudor society. It also perhaps reflected the personal anguish he felt that the more he became involved in Henry VIII's service the less time he had to devote to his family and his 'Academy'.

The measure of the esteem in which he was held by Henry VIII can be seen from the following comment by William Roper:

> and so from time to time he [More] was by the Prince [Henry VIII] advanced, continuing in his singular favour and trusty service twenty years and above, when he had done his devotions to send for him into his private room and there some time in matters of Astronomy, Geometry, Divinity and such other Faculties, and some time in his worldly affairs, to sit and confer with him, and other whiles would he in the night have him up into the leads,[17] there to consider with him the diversities, causes, motions, and operations of the stars and the planets.

Perhaps it was that More was able to live in the world and yet appear to be detached from it in his observances that appealed to so many people. He was clearly able to see both sides of an argument and, as Lord Chancellor, he was regarded as impartial, quick and fair in his judgements, though it is suggested that he was unnecessarily harsh in sentencing those with different religious opinions. Herein lies the clue to his conflict with Henry VIII, and the reason for his downfall and death on the scaffold for treason.

More in the context of the English reformation

By the time More was appointed Lord Chancellor, he had a reputation throughout Europe as a man of wit, charm, intelligence and honesty. Henry regarded him as a friend and counsellor. He believed that he had made the perfect appointment to ensure that he could secure his personal desire – divorce from Catherine of Aragon – while at the same time reforming the Church but not destroying it.

More shared Henry's fears about the Lutheran Reformation, that it could overthrow the old established faith and order. Theologically, he was conservative. Like Colet and Erasmus, More believed that there was a need for greater religious tolerance, for a more rational theology and for reform in the manners and behaviour of the clergy, but he was opposed to any need for a break with the historic Church. It is not without significance, therefore, that Henry used More

to dispute with Luther, and that the Bishop of London, Cuthbert Tunstall, used him to write pamphlets and critical commentaries on Protestant books and arguments. In 1529, for example, More wrote a *Dialogue Concerning Heresies* as a rebuttal of the doctrines of William Tyndale, and *Supplication of Souls* against Simon Fish's attack on the clergy. In 1532 and 1533 he wrote a *Confutation of Tyndale's Answer* and an Apology for the Catholic position. In 1533 he wrote his *Debellation of Salem and Bizance*, against two works by the lawyer, Christopher Saint-Germain, and an *Answer to a Poisoned Book*, against an anonymous work entitled *The Supper of the Lord*, which was for many years attributed to Tyndale, but more recently is believed to have been written by one George Joye.

It is perhaps ironical that in the last few years of his life More's writings on the theological stance of the Church should have been so prolific while the King, whom he loyally served to the end, was busy passing legislation that would change for ever, though not destroy, the position of the Church in England. It is also ironic that Henry, who had used and befriended More, should have turned so forcefully against him. This was as much because he misunderstood More's personality as because he feared his influence. As Lord Chancellor, More was the leading figure in the land after the King. People took note of his views as much for what he was, as for who he was. As Henry's determination to secure a divorce increased, so did More's reluctance to go along with him, not so much because of the divorce per se, but because he saw this as a direct challenge to the papacy. This situation became more acute as Henry moved to be proclaimed Supreme Head of the Church in England (1531). More's position was that Christ was Head of the Church and that Henry was usurping the place of Christ's vicar on earth, the Pope. Accordingly he resigned his seal of office on 16 May 1532 hoping for a quiet life with his family and his books. This was not to be, at least not for very long, since Henry was determined to win his support, knowing that More's approval would secure his own actions. On 12 April 1534, More was summoned to Lambeth to swear an Oath of Allegiance to the Act of Supremacy, which impinged the Pope's authority and upheld Henry VIII's divorce. More twice refused on legal grounds. He was committed to the Tower of London on 17 April and was attainted for 'misprision of Treason' on 1 July 1535 on perjured evidence from Sir Richard Rich, the Solicitor-General, who had previously been helped by More but who now owed allegiance to Thomas Cromwell. According to Roper,[18] the dialogue between More and Rich, which finally crystallized the issue, went as follows:

MORE: I will put you this case. Suppose the Parliament would make a law that God should not be God, would you, Mr Rich, say God were not God?
RICH: No, Sir, that would I not since no Parliament can make any such law.
MORE: No more could the Parliament make the King Supreme Head of the Church.

More was, of course, wrong. He died on the scaffold on 6 July 1535, professing loyalty to the King, but acknowledging a greater loyalty to the King of Heaven.[19] As Bindoff has written:

More was the victim, as he had been an exponent, of the stubborn illusion that any human institution possesses a monopoly of truth or the power to impose its dogmas upon all who are subject to its man-made authority. In More's case the offending institution was a Parliament.[20]

To many people More was, and remains, an enigmatic figure. As Speaker of the House of Commons, for example, he used his position, and his own anti-clerical views, to persuade Parliament to pass several laws limiting the powers of the clergy. For example, clerical fees charged for funerals and wills were to be fixed by Parliament. Clerics were not allowed to take on more than one clerical role.[21] In his *Utopia*, More accused the great abbeys and monasteries of 'turning tillage into pasture', that is of enclosing land for sheep pasture, thus displacing agricultural workers from arable land. However, as Robert Bolt brilliantly shows in his play *A Man for All Seasons*,[22] More was, above all, a man of integrity who was not prepared to put the wishes and whims of an absolute monarch above his own conscience. He was not a social or political climber. Many posts he was offered he did not want but was forced to accept. He opposed hypocrisy and corruption wherever he found them, especially in high places. To More, Cardinal Wolsey epitomized all that was corrupt about the contemporary Church. For this reason, he has often been described as 'the voice of conscience' of the time because, as Speaker of the House of Commons, he championed the cause of freedom of speech. Roper says that when he became Speaker he wished that every man could 'discharge his conscience, and boldly in everything incident among us to declare his advice' without fear of penalty.[23] Hoffmann has also said that More put conscience above all else,[24] while Erasmus, on learning of his execution, commented on the man 'whose soul was more pure than snow, whose genius was such that England never had and never will again have its like'.

This nobility of character is perhaps nowhere better revealed than when he was sentenced to death by the judges in the Tower of London. His final words to them were measured, restrained and honourable:

In this world there will ever be discord and variety of opinion. But I trust that as Paul persecuted Stephen even to death yet both are now united in heaven, we too who are now at variance in this world and differ in our opinions may be one in heart and mind for ever in the world to come. In this hope I pray to God to preserve you all, and especially my Lord the King and to deign always to send him faithful counsellors.[25]

Winston Churchill, writing about More's place in the *History of the English-Speaking Peoples*, observed that:

The resistance of More and Fisher to the royal supremacy in Church government was a noble and heroic stand. They realised the defects of the existing Catholic system, but they hated and feared the aggressive nationalism which was destroying the unity of Christendom. . . . More stood as the defender of all that was finest in the medieval outlook. He represents to history its universality, its belief in spiritual values and its instinctive sense of other-worldliness. Henry VIII with cruel axe decapitated not only a wise and

gifted counsellor, but a system, which, though it had failed to live up to its ideals in practice, had for long furnished mankind with its brightest dreams.[26]

Given the conditions that More faced in the Tower of London during his last year it is all the more remarkable that he continued his writings. Towards the end, when paper and pen had been taken from him, he still managed to write letters in charcoal to the family. His *Treatise on the Passion* and the Latin version, *Exposito passionis*, give a vivid account of Christ's last hours before his death on the Cross, and his *Dialogue of Comfort against Tribulation* is sometimes regarded as his finest work in English. On his death all his works and papers passed to his daughter Margaret (died 1544) and then to a nephew, William Rastell, who compiled the complete English *Works* in 1557. More's Latin works were collected and printed partly in Basle under the title *Lucubriationes* in 1563 and more fully in Louvain in 1565/66 under the title *Opera omnia*. Such was the revulsion at the manner of his dying and the recognition that he had been a man of genius that many biographies appeared in the late sixteenth century, led by the example of son-in-law William Roper's *The Life of Sir Thomas More* (1553).

Thomas More, the Renaissance man and educator

It was as much because of his intellectual ideas as because of his religious writings that Thomas More was so highly regarded by his contemporaries. Writing in 1520, Richard Whittington, a London schoolmaster, said of him: 'More is a man of an angel's wit and singular learning; and as time requireth, a man of marvellous mirth and pastimes and sometimes of as said gravity, as who say, *a man for all seasons*'.[27]

Thomas More, 'whose integrity, personal charm, gentle determination and miserable fate make him the most attractive figure of the early sixteenth century,'[28] along with his great friend Erasmus, gave emphasis to the moral and religious thinking in Renaissance studies, not just to the pagan or artistic influences that predominated in and from Italy. They were as concerned with the philosophical and moral issues raised by the Greek writers like Plato and Aristotle as they were with history and legends. This was one aspect that was to distinguish England from the rest of continental Europe. Not only did More help preserve English common law at the expense of Roman law, but in educational matters he encouraged a religious/moral dimension as well as an academic one.

It was More's versatility in languages – English, Latin and Greek – his intellectual curiosity into different aspects of culture, painting and music, his willingness to discourse on diverse matters of importance, as well as to engage in lighthearted banter, that set him apart from so many of his contemporaries. More would have called himself a humanist, not in the modern sense of the word as being man-centred and anti-God, but as a person who was concerned about humanities and the state of the world. The growth of the Renaissance, especially

in the fifteenth century when Greek and Latin manuscripts were discovered and reproduced on the newly invented printing presses, set off a wave of admiration for classical ideas and writers. It was recognized that both the world and mankind had aspects of beauty and that there was enormous scope for creativity. It was into this pattern of thinking and perceiving the world that More and his friends fitted. Strictly speaking, humanists were university experts in Greek and Latin, men like More, Colet, Linacre, Erasmus and Roger Ascham, but the Renaissance humanists believed that they also had a breadth of interest in other fields – religion and moral philosophy, the humanities and the liberal arts, science and natural philosophy, and a sympathy for all subjects of human interest. Many, like More, would not only read and converse in Greek and Latin and the mother tongue, in this case English, but they would also know other languages – French, Italian or Spanish. More's sympathy for this view shows through in the following extract from *Utopia*:

> You may see our friend Raphael – for that's his name, Raphael Hythlodaeus – is quite a scholar. He knows a fair amount of Latin and a tremendous lot of Greek. He's concentrated on Greek because he's interested in philosophy and he found that there's nothing important on that subject written in Latin, apart from bits of Seneca and Cicero.[29]

More set out some of his views on education in a letter to Peter Gilles, who was Chief Secretary of Antwerp at the time.[30] 'As you know', he wrote, 'my young assistant John Clement[31] was with us at the time. I never let him miss any conversation that might have some educational value, for he has already begun to show such promise in Latin and Greek that I expect great things of him one day.' Later he says: 'I am extremely anxious to get my facts right . . . for I'd much rather be thought honest than clever.' He is equally scornful of some of his fellowmen.

> Most readers know nothing about literature – many regard it with contempt. Lowbrows find everything heavygoing that isn't completely lowbrow. Highbrows reject everything as vulgar that isn't a mass of archaisms. Some only like classics, others only their own works. Some are so firmly serious that they disapprove of all humour, others so half-witted that they can't stand wit.[32]

In letters to a tutor of his children (Peter Gunnell), More gives very careful directions about their education. He strongly advocates the higher education of women especially in the classics and philosophy, an antidote to boring lessons in music, needlework and cookery. Indeed, More's daughters wrote and frequently discussed issues at home in Latin. The trouble was that the form in which education existed at the beginning of the sixteenth century was sterile and dull, Church dominated, and consisted of rote learning of the catechism and Latin conjugations, some number work and some translation from Latin to English and vice versa. The growing awareness of a whole new way of perceiving the world as a place of beauty, and of people as persons of beauty and personality which came from Greek literature, transformed attitudes towards education and More sought to put these into practice in his 'Academy'.

More's 'Academy'

More moved house several times during his career, but he had a house built at Chelsea to which he moved in 1517, though all the buildings were not finished until 1523. When completed the household consisted of an extended family of twenty-one, plus numerous other inmates. More had built for himself a separate building with a chapel, a library and a gallery. On Fridays he spent his time there in study and prayer. However, the whole of his home was an educational experiment. He taught his wife and family how to sing and play different musical instruments, how to read and discuss philosophical and theological issues in both Latin and English, and occasionally in Greek. There was no distinction between men and women, and it has been suggested that More's household was 'a model to all ages of domestic felicity.'[33]

The clearest picture we have of More's domestic life is from Erasmus, a great friend and long-term visitor, who wrote:

> You might say of him that he presides over a Second Academy like that of Plato, only that instead of geometry and figures you meet there the domestic virtues. All the members of his household find occupation. No harsh word is uttered but discipline is maintained by courtesy and kindness. . . . in More's household you would realise that Plato's academy was revived, except that in the Academy the discussions concerned geometry and the power of numbers, whereas the house at Chelsea is a veritable school of Christian religion. . . . In it is none, man or women, but readeth or studieth the liberal arts. Yet it is their chief care of piety. There is never any seen idle. The head of the house governs it, not by lofty carriage and frequent rebukes, but by gentleness and amiable manners.[34]

This was in stark contrast to the frequent floggings that boys used to receive in public schools for forgetting their lessons.

More believed strongly that children are gifts from God, to the parents, to God and to the nation. It is important, therefore, that they receive not only a good training and upbringing from their parents but also from the state and from the Church which should provide an adequate supply of well-qualified teachers of the young. These views are developed in *Utopia*. One of the problems of schooling in the early sixteenth century was that teachers lacked adequate training. More felt that the state had a clear moral responsibility not only to provide adequate teacher training but, by implication, that it should also provide the school system itself.[35]

More not only acted as a focal point for many of the Renaissance humanist scholars of the time but his 'Academy' was where he loved to hold court, because there he could put into practice many of his personal beliefs – easy discourse with his wife, children and friends without reference to class or gender distinction; discussion of the arts and literature, as well as religion and external values.

He was as much concerned for discipline in the context of a civilized and polite atmosphere as he was for open discussion between the sexes. Apart from Erasmus, his friends and followers included John Colet (founder of St Paul's

School, London); Hans Holbein the Younger, who painted a portrait of More in 1527 which still hangs in London's National Portrait Gallery; Fisher, the founder of several Cambridge colleges; Linacre, the Greek scholar, founder of the Oxford college that bears his name, and founder and President of the Royal College of Physicians. Two friends who were particularly impressed by what they heard and saw were Sir Thomas Elyot (1490-1546), author of *The Boke Named 'the Governour'* (1531), the first educational book written in English rather than Latin, and Roger Ascham, tutor to Queen Elizabeth I and author of *The Scholemaster* (1570). These books were to have a profound influence on the shape of schools and the curriculum well into the seventeenth century.

From some of Erasmus' observations of More the man, it is easy to see why he attracted such a following. In one letter he says that 'from earliest childhood [More] had such a passion for jokes, that one might almost suppose he had been born for them'.[36] In another letter to Ulrich von Hutton, a German Knight, dated Antwerp, 23 July 1519,[37] Erasmus says of Thomas More:

> His expression corresponds to his character, always showing a pleasant and friendly gaiety, and rather set in a smiling look; and to speak honestly, better suited to merriment than to seriousness and solemnity, though far removed from silliness and buffoonery. . . . In social intercourse he is of so rare a courtesy and charm of manners that there is no man so melancholy that he does not gladden, no subject so forbidding that he does not dispel the tedium of it. . . . In human relations he looks for pleasure in everything he comes across, even in the gravest matters. If he has to do with intelligent and educated men, he takes pleasure in their brilliance; if with the ignorant and foolish, he enjoys their folly.

Utopia

More's educational philosophy was strongly influenced both by his friends and colleagues and by their open discussions, but also by his own readings, observation and political convictions. He had a strong belief in man's ability to achieve and to rise above adversity; to become involved in the arts, literature, music and philosophy, as well as to be aware of scientific developments. While most of his views were orally expressed and influenced future writers, and while we know what he felt and thought from some of his letters and from Erasmus' observations, no profile of Sir Thomas More would be complete without reference to two of his published works for which he became most famous, *Utopia* (1516) and his *History of Richard III* (1543).

Utopia first appeared in its Latin version in 1516. The English translation did not appear until 1556, but by then its main arguments were widely known and had been widely debated. Utopia must mark out More as one of the most eminent humanist thinkers and visionaries of the Renaissance period. It is still hotly debated. According to Turner,[38] there are two schools of thought concerning its content and purpose. One view is that *Utopia* is predominantly a Catholic tract, in which the author sets out his own views and anything resembling communist propaganda is mere allegory. The other view is that it is a politi-

cal manifesto in which all references to religion should be ignored. Both views are only partly true.

Although *Utopia* is a political satire it is also an allegorical, romantic piece of writing. 'It professes like Horace's Satires to "tell the truth with a laugh", or like Lucian's True History, "not merely to be witty and entertaining, but also to say something interesting".'[39]

The story is set on an imaginary island where there are no wars, poverty, crime, injustice or any other ills that so beset contemporary Europe. Everyone has an equal stake in wealth, food and poverty. No one has more than any others. The state oversees and ensures a fair distribution of resources, including health care. The working day is limited to six hours, while the remaining leisure time is devoted to the study of the arts, literature and science. Crafts and vocational courses are available to all, so that everyone has at least mastered one practical skill. Fighting is permitted only in self-defence and law-breakers are condemned to slavery. Religion is an undenominational theism and priests are chosen for their holiness. Every child, boy or girl, is entitled to a comprehensive education. This would include a study of literature, the classics, the arts, science and mathematics – what today would be called 'a balanced curriculum'. Children should also be made politically aware in civics classes. The state should be responsible both for providing education and for ensuring a supply of trained teachers. Girls should be treated no differently from boys.

More's purpose in writing *Utopia* was quite clearly to open people's eyes to the social and political evils of the world around them, for example inflation, corruption, maltreatment of the poor, wars for little or no purpose, courtly ostentation, the misuse of power by absolute monarchs, and so on. More used works of Greek derivation to make his point. 'Thus, Hythlodaeus means "dispenser of nonsense"; Utopia means "not place"; Anydrus, the name of a river, means "not water"; and Ademus, the title of the Chief Magistrate means "not people".'[40] It is clear from a letter to Peter Gilles that More expected his educated readers to understand the significance of these names because he deliberately used Greek names for places and official titles and also because he wished his readers to realize that they were imaginary. Difficulties have arisen for many readers because More, a devout Roman Catholic, advocated euthanasia, marriage of priests, divorce by mutual consent on grounds of incompatibility, allowing future husbands and wives to see each other naked before agreeing to marriage. Many readers also believe that the basic ideas expressed in *Utopia* are communistic. Even in the 1990s, *Utopia* remains a highly readable book, but it must be noted that it does not represent a positive ideal, but a negative attack on European wickedness as perceived by More. Its object was to shame Christians into behaving not worse, as they did then, but far better then the poor Utopian heathen. 'It is expressed in a timeless medium, which cuts it loose from its own particular age and saves it from ever seeming linguistically old fashioned or difficult.'[41]

Although there are references to Plato and some of More's ideas are clearly drawn from *The Republic* and *The Laws*, his basic approach is quite different. Both agreed that the role of the state in educational provision should be paramount, but whereas Plato only hinted at communism, More saw it as a basis for society. Whereas Plato was largely concerned with the education of the ruling classes, More regarded the producers, especially agricultural labourers, as of high value.

> Admittedly only a few bright children academically should be allowed to be students. But every child receives a primary education and most men and women go on educating themselves all their lives during those free periods that I told you about. Everything's taught in their own language for it has quite a rich vocabulary.[42]

This is a quite clear attack on the use of Latin rather than English for schooling. While Plato encouraged warfare and regarded the virtues of martial arts highly, More sought to uphold peaceful values. Rather than wasting time,

> most people spend those free periods on further education for there are public lectures first thing every morning. Attendance is quite voluntary, except for those picked out for academic training, but men and women of all classes go crowding in to hear them – I mean different people to different lectures, just as the spirit moves them.[43]

Plato largely ignores family life, but for More the family is the basis of society; women are accorded a high place in the family and are encouraged intellectually, although More never recognizes equality in all things. Where Plato is serious, More is satirical, and whereas Plato banished art, poetry and music, More positively supports the arts.

Three other educational ideas emerge from *Utopia*. The first is:

> In *Utopia*, where everything is under state control . . . they never force people to work unnecessarily, for the main purpose of their whole economy is to give each person as much free time from physical drudgery as the needs of the community will allow; so that he can cultivate his mind, which they regard as the secret of a happy life.[44]

The second is that children and adults should freely intermix and learn from one another, an idea only really developed in the late twentieth century. The third idea is that all education should have a strong moral element imparted by priests who are 'responsible for the education of children and adolescents'. If moral ideas 'are thoroughly absorbed in childhood, these ideas will persist throughout adult life and so will contribute greatly to the safety of the state, which is never seriously threatened except by moral defects arising from wrong ideas'.[45]

Although *Utopia* was to become a best-seller and ensured More a reputation throughout Europe, it was not until after his death that it was realized that More also had another gift, that of historian. His complete *History of Richard III* first appeared in 1543 as a continuation of Hardyng's *Chronicle* and Polydore Vergil's *Anglicae historica*. It portrayed Richard as an arch villain and was to influence the perception of Richard held by subsequent generations, while

Shakespeare's play, *Richard III*, drew heavily on More's interpretation and provided a vivid, if inaccurate, picture of the king. There are two remarkable aspects of the *History* which tell us much about More.

> More's *Richard III* is the first great work of prose in the English language; it initiates modern historical writing – for all the glories of the Elizabethan Age, there is nothing that comes close to matching it until Bacon's Henry VII (1622) and as a bilingual narrative it is unique.[46]

That it was the first historical work of any literary value which we possess in the English language is one thing; that it was written in both English and Latin at the same time is a touch of genius.

More was able 'to shape recent events into the sort of history his humanist training and his humanist friends approved, that is, a dramatic, boldly patterned narrative, soaring beyond actualities into art and seeking psychological verisimilitude rather than factual accuracy'.[47] In writing in this way, he inspired subsequent generations of historians to write in a similar vein and he influenced perceptions about Richard III until a reassessment began in the eighteenth century with Horace Walpole's *Historic Doubt on the Life and Reign of King Richard III* in which he challenged More's views. Since then numerous 'Friends of Richard III' societies have sprung up on both sides of the Atlantic. To be fair, More was strongly influenced by Archbishop Morton and other contemporary views, and while part of the purpose of writing the history was to criticize the brutality of contemporary kingship, he stopped writing for fear of impugning both Henry VII and Henry VIII as tyrants. Instead he used the satirical *Utopia* to get across his message.

Thomas More's legacy

More's place in English and European history is secure, not only because of his *Utopia* but because of his principled stand against tyranny and his clear example that conscience and morality can triumph over evil. That he could only slow down, but not prevent, the course of the English Reformation was, in hindsight, inevitable. That he influenced future perceptions about Richard III, that he inspired parliamentarians in the seventeenth and subsequent centuries to strive for freedom of speech and the preservation of English Common Law, and that he gave a name to an idealized world of the future, *Utopia*, are no mean achievements.

His two greatest legacies, however, must be in his manner of writing and in his educational views. More inspired a whole genre of literature, of idealistic and futuristic writing and of fantastic traveller's tales. Well over 100 titles have been published adopting this style. If we were to name but a few, the list would include: Joseph Hale's *Another World and Yet the Same* (1600); Andrae's *Christianopolis* (1619); Bacon's *New Atlantis* (1626); Harrington's *Oceania* (1656); Swift's *Gulliver's Travels* (1726); Voltaire's *Candide* (1759); William

Morris' *News from Nowhere* (1890); H. G. Wells's *The Time Machine* (1895); Huxley's *Brave New World* (1932); James Hilltop's *Lost Horizon* (1933); George Orwell's *1984* (1949); and the list could go on.

Regarding his educational ideas, many of these now seem commonplace to us – state provision; the education of both boys and girls, as well as of adults; a balanced curriculum; moral as well as academic schooling; the use of the vernacular for instruction – but their roots, especially in English educational tradition can easily be traced back to More's *Utopia*, and Erasmus' descriptions of More's 'Academy'. That socialists can lay claim to More's ideals of state control and provision of education, and that liberals can claim that the idea of a broad and balanced curriculum was originally More's, is no small feat. Sir Thomas More was truly 'a man for all seasons'.

Notes

1. G. R. Elton, *England under the Tudors*, p. 139, London, Methuen, 1957.
2. Reader's Digest Association, *Milestones of History*: Vol. 5, *Reform and Revolt*, p. 55, London, Reader's Digest, 1974.
3. The other two were Colet and Erasmus.
4. There is some confusion about whether or not he really did sympathize with communism. See Appendix to Paul Turner (trans.), *Utopia*, Harmondsworth, Penguin Books, 1965.
5. Two of the best books on this period are Paul Kendall's *Richard III* (London, Book Club Associates, 1955) and Charles Ross's *Edward IV* (London, Book Club Associates, 1975). The Wars of the Roses were so called because the emblem of the House of Lancaster was a red rose and that of the House of York a white rose.
6. It is suggested that the princes were murdered in the Tower of London on the orders of Richard III. For a discussion of this see Paul Kendall, 'Introduction', *Richard III: the Great Debate*, London, Folio Society, 1965.
7. Until the reign of Mary Tudor (Mary I, 1553-58) the law of primogeniture prevailed whereby only a male heir could accede to the throne.
8. See William Roper, *The Life of Sir Thomas More*, p. 70, London, Dent, 1932.
9. A profile of Erasmus appears in this series of '100 Thinkers on Education'.
10. H. B. Cotterill, 'Introduction' to R. Robynson, *The 'Utopia' of Sir Thomas More*, London, Macmillan, 1908.
11. According to Erasmus, More preferred the second daughter but, feeling that the first would have lost face, he decided to marry her instead!
12. Evidence comes from Erasmus' letters, see: P. S. Allen, H. M. Allen & H. W. Garrod, *Opus epistolarum Desiderii Erasmi*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1906-58, 12 vols.
13. W. Rastell, *The Complete English Works of Sir Thomas More*, 1553; reprinted by Oxford University Press, 1931.
14. So called because of the pomp and glitter resulting from so many European monarchs being present together.
15. Roper, op. cit., p. 35.
16. 'FID:DEF' (Defender of the Faith) has appeared on all subsequent English coinage.

17. On the roof. Most Tudor houses had sheets of lead below the roof tiles to act as rain-water guttering. Roper, op. cit., p. 7.
18. Ibid., p. 103.
19. At his execution More said: 'I die loyal to God and the King, but to God first of all.'
20. S. T. Bindoff, *Tudor England*, p. 103, London, Penguin Books, 1952.
21. Clerics in Tudor England were not necessarily clergymen. They would have been 'hangers on' in abbeys and monasteries serving as vergers, clerks, finance officers, etc.
22. Robert Bolt, *A Man for All Seasons*, London, Heinemann, 1955.
23. Roper, op. cit., p. 64.
24. Ann Hoffmann, *Lives of the Tudor Age, 1485-1603*, London, Osprey Publishers, 1977.
25. Roper, op. cit., pp. 102-03.
26. W. S. Churchill, *A History of the English-Speaking Peoples*, Vol. 2, London, Cassell, 1956.
27. Cited in *Collier's Encyclopedia*, Vol. 16, p. 542, New York, Macmillan & Collier, 1976.
28. Elton, op. cit, p. 139.
29. Turner, op. cit., p. 38.
30. Peter Gilles was Town Clerk of Antwerp, 1515-20.
31. John Clement (died 1572) was taken into More's household as a tutor to his children, one of whom, his adopted daughter Margaret Gigs, he married in 1526. He later became Mary Tudor's physician.
32. Letter to Peter Gilles in Elizabeth F. Rogers (ed.), *The Correspondence of Sir Thomas More*, p. 91, 1947. (Reprinted: Salem, N.H., Ayer Company.)
33. Bindoff, op. cit., p. 103.
34. Allen, op. cit., p. xxv.
35. William Boyd, *The History of Western Education*, pp. 237-38, London, Adam & Charles Black, 1947.
36. Allen, op. cit., Vol. IV, p. 17.
37. Quoted in C. R. N. Routh, *They Saw it Happen, 1485-1588*, p. 26, Oxford, Blackwell, 1956.
38. 'Introduction', Turner, op. cit., p. 7.
39. Ibid., p. 7.
40. Ibid., p. 8.
41. Ibid., p. 22.
42. Ibid., p. 89.
43. Ibid., p. 76.
44. Ibid., p. 78-79.
45. Ibid, p. 123.
46. Kendall, op. cit., p. 24.
47. Ibid., p. 25.

Works by Sir Thomas More

Lucian's Menippus Goes to Hell, 1505. (With Erasmus. Translated into Latin.)
Life of John Picus, Earl of Mirandula. 1509-10.
History of King Richard III, 1513. (Not published until 1543, i.e. after his death.)
Letter to Peter Gilles, 1515.
Utopia, 1516. (Latin version.)
Letter to Oxford University Defending 'Great Studies', 1518.
Epigrams, 1520.
The Four Last Things, 1522.
Dialogue Concerning Heresies, 1529.
Treatise on the Passion, 1535.
The English Works of Sir Thomas More, 1557. (Edited by William Rastell.) Reprinted Oxford University Press, 1931.
Lucubrationes, 1563. (A selection of his Latin works.)
Opera Omnia, 1567. (His complete Latin works.)

Works about Sir Thomas More

Allen, P. S.; Allen, H. M.; Garrod, H. W. *Opus epistolarum Desiderii Erasmi*. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1906-58. 12 vols. (Includes correspondence between More and Erasmus.)
Bridgett, T. E. *Life of Sir Thomas More*. Oxford, 1891.
Chambers, R. W. *Thomas More*. Oxford, 1935.
More, C. *The Life and Death of Sir Thomas More*. Saint Omer or Douai, 1631. Reprinted (edited by J. Hunter), London, 1828.
Manning, A. *The Household of Sir Thomas More*. London, Dent, 1885.
More, T. *The Correspondence of Sir Thomas More*. (Edited by E. F. Rogers.) Oxford, 1947.
——. *The 'Utopia' of Sir Thomas More*. (Translated by R. Robynson, with an introduction by H. B. Cotterill.) London, Macmillan, 1909.
——. *Utopia*. (Translated into English with an introduction by Paul Turner.) Harmondsworth, Penguin Books, 1965.
Reynolds, E. E. *The Field Is Won: The Life and Death of Sir Thomas More*. London, Macmillan, 1968.
Roper, W. *The Life of Sir Thomas More*. 1553. Republished in 1906 and subsequent reprints by Dent, London.
Routh, E. M. G. *Sir Thomas More and his Friends*. Oxford, Blackwell, 1934.
Seebohm, F. *The Oxford Reformers*. London, Dent, 1938. (Everyman edition. Reprinted, New York, AMS Press, 1972.)

J.P. NAIK[1]

(1907–81)

A.R. Kamat

J. P. Naik, who was well known to educationists all over the world, died in August 1981. India lost the doyen of its educational thinkers and organizers. Indian social scientists lost their greatest friend and benefactor since the establishment of the Indian Council of Social Science Research, and world education was deprived of the ablest exponent of the Indian educational situation and of educational problems in the developing countries in general.

Naik was involved in the field of Indian education for more than four decades, and played a central role for the last twenty years. His was the largest single influence in originating and promoting Indian educational research, in institutionalizing educational innovations and reforms, and also in educational planning and policy-making.

Early activities

A brief account of Naik's early life should help us better to understand the man, his thoughts and his work. He came from a poor rural family and would have been unable to escape the rural agricultural trap had not his intelligence and love of learning come to the notice of one of his benevolent relatives, who saw to it that he received a secondary and college education. He had a brilliant academic career and his versatile mind was equally interested in literature, history and mathematics. Perhaps his mathematical skill explains his quantitative approach and mastery over figures in his educational writings, his liberal use of educational statistics and also his simple, precise and direct approach to the complex problems of education.

By the time Naik had taken his first degree, the national movement for liberation in India had entered the phase of civil disobedience under Gandhi's leadership. He threw himself into the movement, served a prison sentence and, thereafter, like a good Gandhian, started constructive work in the rural areas, including rural education. Naik is one of the few educationists, perhaps the only

one, in India to have worked in diverse roles, from village primary-school teacher to being educational adviser to the Central Ministry of Education in New Delhi.

Naik's varied interests ranged from a major concern with education to rural development, health and medical care, to promotion of social science research. His educational activities started during the early 1930s with the establishment and running of primary schools in rural areas in the south of the then Bombay Presidency; and mass education, including literacy, adult education and basic education, in the Bombay Province before and after the popular ministries assumed office in 1937. He wrote about the history of Indian education since the beginning of British imperial rule and prepared edited volumes of educational archives. He was involved in the establishment of the Indian Institute of Education for post-graduate training and research in Bombay between 1948 and 1959. He was also concerned with founding and running a rural educational-cum-development institute near Kolhapur. He was drafted as Educational Adviser to the Central Ministry of Education, where he worked without a salary and helped in that capacity to establish several new educational institutions, such as the National Council of Educational Research and Training (NCERT), Jawaharlal Nehru University and the National Institute of Educational Planning and Administration (NIEPA). He was member-secretary of the Education Commission, the first such commission in independent India (1964-66). He made valiant efforts to get some of the commission's more important recommendations accepted and enforced by the government. He worked closely with UNESCO and other international organizations responsible for education. His last institutional endeavour was the revival of the Indian Institute of Education (IIE) in Pune from 1977 onwards, a project that he cherished.

Naik was also drawn as an active participant into many committees and commissions on education at state and central levels. And, of course, he wrote extensively on several educational themes. He was the ablest and the most knowledgeable person in the field of Indian education. As one of his friends and admirers once remarked, Naik knew almost everything about Indian education and what he did not know was not worth knowing!

Before we attempt an account and critical analysis of Naik's educational contribution, it is necessary to mention two more factors: the initial influences on his thought and his connection in later years with the Indian Council of Social Science Research (ICSSR). Both contributed greatly to the evolution of his educational ideas.

The initial influences on Naik's educational (and other) thought were those of the on-going national movement under Gandhi's leadership, on the one hand, and of his own socio-economic and educational work among the rural poor, on the other. Naturally enough, national education, basic education (expounded by Gandhi and Gandhian educationists) and Gandhian thought in general made a deep impression on his work. But he was also well versed in Western liberal educational thought.

After Naik had begun to work systematically and vigorously as Secretary to the ICSSR fostering social science research in India, he supervised social science research, young social scientists and a number of research institutions. He gave social science research in India its present wide range, bringing in such fields as the status of women in India and social change among the weaker sections of society. At the same time, this ICSSR connection changed his own perspective on the Indian educational situation and, as will be indicated later, changed his understanding of the relationship between educational change and social change.

Naik's educational thought

To describe and analyse the educational ideas of Naik is not an easy task, for he had a prolific output. Even if his non-educational writings are excluded, his books alone run into more than thirty-five titles. In addition, there are numerous reports of the commissions and committees in which he participated. It is no exaggeration to say that whenever Naik was a member of a committee or commission he was invariably also the author of its report, which incorporated a number of his own ideas on that theme. Inevitably these books, booklets and reports taken together cover almost every aspect of Indian education.

It is impossible to deal with all these writings in a piecemeal manner. They are therefore divided for convenience into: (a) historical writings, including his histories of Indian education, and the editing of educational archives and yearbooks of education; (b) basic education, the educational model of Gandhi and its modifications by his followers, education and work experience, and its latest variant of socially useful productive work; (c) mass education including universalization of elementary or primary education, adult education, non-formal education, continuing education, etc.; (d) educational planning and administration, that is, state-level, district-level and local-level planning and improvement of educational management and administration; (e) exercises outlining grand national designs for educational transformation, which started with the monumental report of the Education Commission, entitled *Education and National Development* (1966*a*),[2] and was continued during later years under the general title of *Alternatives in Development*, including his last work, *Education Commission and After* (1982*a*); and (f) the relationship between education and society, between educational transformation and social transformation.

History of Indian education

Naik's historical writings and editing of parts of archives may be considered as pioneering efforts in the field. His two books on the history of modern Indian education (1945 and 1974*b*), the larger volume and its shorter version (written in collaboration with S. Nurulla), were the first systematic attempts to cover the subject in a comprehensive manner with relevant extracts and statistical data. They pointed out that there was a fairly efficient and indigenous education

system operating in many parts of the country before and at the time of the British conquest. The authors have described its strong and weak points and have rightly emphasized that the modern Western education system introduced by Macaulay and Wood, instead of utilizing the traditional system, simply ignored it, much to the detriment of mass education. It could have been continued and strengthened by modernizing its content and organization. Some of the British rulers also belatedly realized the value of indigenous education at the time of the Education Commission of 1882. By that time, however, irreparable damage had been done and the old system was dying out.

The two books on history, first written some fifty years ago, do have a general nationalist viewpoint but are not much more than conventional chronological histories of education. Their main weakness is that they make no attempt at a socio-political and socio-economic analysis of educational development. Subsequently, Naik himself became keenly aware of this serious lacuna. Hence the author created questionable historical categories, calling the British period after 1921 a period of Indianization. In reality, although Indian ministers held the education portfolio, they could hardly claim to have pursued an independent educational policy under British rule.

Basic education in schools

We shall next consider basic education in schools, propagated initially by Gandhi and later modified by Gandhian educationists, its vicissitudes after independence up to its latest reincarnations in the form of work experience and socially useful productive work (SUPW). While Naik had written on basic education, and as a good Gandhian sponsored the ideas as early as 1937, it also recurs in his writings after the Education Commission (1964-66). It must be noted, however, that this basic educational innovation failed. It was accepted neither by the urban nor the rural populations for their own (separate) reasons. Its attempt to introduce craftwork also failed, and for the same reasons. The same has been the fate of work experience and SUPW, which are now largely neglected. Work experience or SUPW can succeed only in a society that is either rapidly industrializing itself or where industrialization is largely achieved. Even in such a context, the contents must be reviewed periodically to adapt to changes taking place in production processes. The real reason for the failure of all these ideas in India is that the Indian reality was never the (rural) society that Gandhi had advocated, nor the socialist society that launches industrialization in a determined manner as socialized production. Neither Naik nor the other advocates of basic education or its later variants appear to have realized this basic incongruity. Harking back to precapitalist or an incipient capitalist era, as did Gandhi and Gandhians, or borrowing uncritically from foreign models do not help in the reality of India today.

Mass education

Let me now take up Naik's intellectual contribution to mass education, that is, universalization of elementary education (at least primary education for the 6-to-11 age-group), adult education, non-formal education, etc. Naik's earlier writings and activities go back to the 1930s and 1940s, and the later revival follows the recommendations of the Education Commission's Report (ECR) (1966*a*) and writings during the last ten to fifteen years. He then described the neglect of mass education by the British rulers, and the efforts of G. K. Gokhale to R. V. Parulekar (1957) are cogently described, with the apparently 'non-formal' solutions of Rajagopalachari and Vinoba Bhave, in addition to the normal formal schooling system, which insists on single-entry, sequential and full-time education. He then points out that for school education to be universal it will have to be supplemented by a multiple-entry, part-time, non-formal education which does not insist on sequentiality. His sponsorship of the 'neighbourhood' or common school is also essentially sound.

But Naik sees to his chagrin that all these 'reasonable' ideas are only accepted in theory, without a serious effort of implementation in practice, that the National Adult Education Programme inaugurated with such fanfare in 1978 only limps along. He blames it all on the Indian education system, which is 'class' education and not 'mass' education, and calls out for a 'mass movement' for the universalization of elementary education, including adult education. Naik does not see that, in all societies based on class, education is always 'class' education, so that labelling it as such does not take us much further. His call for a mass movement for this purpose, as though such a movement can just be ordered, betrays an inherent weakness in his thinking. In an extremely poor, deprived and unequal society, like that of India, education has no high priority in the minds of the vast majority of people. A 'mass movement' is bound to arise in due course to confront the present social predicament, but it will be for far more basic needs like food, shelter and jobs and the other bare necessities for life. Education will at best be an additional demand. Thus the efforts to spread non-formal education and efficient implementation of the formal system cannot be realized in the present socio-economic and political framework and power structure, except in a limited fashion. Their ultimate realization will occur in the coming struggle for a radical socio-economic transformation of society. It should, however, be stated to Naik's credit that, after the revival of the IIE, he started an experimental project in non-formal education in rural areas, a project whose progress will be eagerly followed by concerned educationists.

After joining the Central Ministry of Education in New Delhi in the early 1960s, Naik immediately felt the necessity of emphasizing educational planning at all levels, for both the extension and qualitative improvement of education at all stages. For the latter purpose, it was also necessary to improve educational management and administration at all levels. He pursued both these ideas, and the establishment of NIEPA gave a tangible base for their successful dissemina-

tion. But if we survey the educational scene over recent decades, we can only conclude that the education system, except in the élitist segments, has deteriorated further at all levels due to both unplanned expansion and widespread mismanagement.

On education and society

Finally, we shall consider Naik's grand schemes for the reconstruction of Indian education and his ideas about the relationship between education and society, between educational change and social change. The last fifteen years of his life were devoted to thought in these areas. He wrote several books, continually reformulating his thought. It should, however, be stated that although he changed his stance on the relationship between education and society considerably, he never gave up putting forward newer models for educational reconstruction, returning to the ECR for their origins. This work went on in continued succession until his very last publication, *The Education Commission and After* (1982*a*), and its abbreviated version, *An Assessment of Educational Reform in India and Lessons for the Future* (1980), published by UNESCO in its series of 'Reflections on the Future Development of Education'.

It is necessary first to state the important facets of Naik's educational ideas as reflected in the ECR. First, the ECR explicitly stated that the present education system is a dual system, in other words it is just a continuation of the system operating under the former British imperial administration. It ought therefore to be replaced by a proper national education system geared to the social transformation of Indian society. The proposed education system has therefore to be related to: (a) enhanced productivity; (b) social and national integration; (c) consolidation of democracy and promoting the process of modernization; (d) cultivation of science and scientific temper; and (e) the fostering of appropriate social, moral and spiritual values. With these objectives the ECR drew up a grand design of the proposed national system, making detailed and exhaustive recommendations on all aspects of education. Second, ECR thinking was firmly rooted in the belief that education was the one and only instrument of social 'change on a grand scale' in India, that is, for radical social transformation.

Before commenting on these ideas, it is perhaps in order to say a few words about the actual implementation of the ECR. As Naik himself stated clearly in his last publication, *The Education Commission and After* (1982*a*), what the government did was to adopt a very mild policy resolution, the National Educational Policy Resolution of 1968. The resolution ignored almost all the important ideas and recommendations of the ECR, incorporating only some minor recommendations. Moreover, even the latter were never seriously implemented.

It is clear that Naik's thinking in the ECR on education and society largely follows the tradition/modernity paradigm for social change in developing countries, a paradigm so insistently propagated by Western social scientists in the

post-Second World War years. To that extent, it abandons the historical approach and ignores the primacy of socio-economic and socio-political structural changes. It also displays the all-inclusive 'hold-all' character of most thinking in India, of stringing together every 'good' thing from every advanced country irrespective of its historical or present relevance. Self-identity must link the present 'modernity' with the 'spiritual and moral values' and the age-old 'wisdom' of the Indian heritage. Inevitably the whole package of ideas becomes extremely diffuse, as has happened to the ideas of 'secularism' and the 'combining science with spiritual values' in the ECR exposition.

But Naik's ECR stand did not last long. Already by the mid-1970s he was writing about the necessity of a *simultaneous* advance in both educational and social reordering, of 'political and economic' efforts to change the structure, of adopting Freire's conscientization approach in adult education, etc. A few years later a further change in his understanding of the relationship between education and society, between educational and social transformation can be detected. He now speaks of the necessity of having a 'vision of the new society' and putting 'political content' into Indian education. He concedes that the educational design, however grand and meticulously prepared, has no chance of being implemented in the absence of favourable political and socio-structural conditions. This idea can be traced to his general disillusionment with India's stagnating situation in the educational and, more fundamentally, in the socio-economic and socio-political spheres. By that time, international educational and development thinking had also, even if partially, witnessed the bankruptcy of the tradition/modernity paradigm and was finding itself at a loose end. The so-called 'golden-age of education' had totally vanished, leading to acute disillusionment. But whatever the reasons, Naik's ideas underwent a definite change; his ideological stance was becoming sharper and more precise. Even so, he did not give up preparing simultaneous transformation on the educational and socio-political fronts. He stuck to what he called Gandhian thought, to the necessity of combining science with spiritual values, to his insistence on harking back to the wisdom of the past – without clarifying what he meant. At the same time he was now convinced that the initiative towards the creation of the new egalitarian social order would have to be undertaken by the poor and oppressed themselves. He now recognized the crucial role of political and social workers outside the education system in the task of organizing the poor and the underprivileged for this purpose.

In his last work, *Education Commission and After*, undertaken during the very last phase of his life, Naik goes even further in his own critique of his theoretical basis in the ECR. Here he frankly admits that the framework adopted in the ECR about education and development had basic weaknesses, since it did not even refer to the extreme poverty and deprivation in Indian society, and the highly unequal distribution of earnings, wealth and political power – the fundamental problems of Indian society, which need to be faced squarely. His close association with social science research in the ICSSR had changed his outlook

and he would have preferred to have been Secretary of the ICSSR before becoming Secretary of the Education Commission! He also confesses the incorrectness of according primacy to education in social transformation and that such a view may divert the attention of concerned people from attending to first things first, from having recourse to direct action. Thus, this paradigm may do a disservice to the cause of social transformation itself.

Naik also realizes that his exposition of the idea of combining science with the spiritual legacy of India was also weak and tries to make amends for it, dealing with it at length, though in our opinion even the new exposition suffers from vagueness and remains unconvincing. Moreover, he does not now bring in Gandhian thought to any appreciable extent.

Thus, during the decade and a half from the drafting of the ECR to his final formulations in the ECA, Naik has almost completely given up his idealist position on the relationship between education and society. He no longer insists that education has primary importance in social transformation. But he still clings to his old formulation of combining science and the spiritual values or age-old wisdom of India. And like a wise pragmatist, anxious to remain in the main current of the Indian educational world, he continues to subscribe to his simultaneous approach and to repeat and reform his grand designs for educational reconstruction in India.

Naik as reformer

I am aware that in a short profile one cannot do adequate justice to J. P. Naik's extensive contribution to educational thought and activities in India. Considering the wide range of his rich educational career, spanning almost two generations, it can be said without hesitation that his is easily the largest single contribution to the cause of Indian education. He researched, wrote, lectured and founded institutions in diverse fields of education. Equally important was his role in encouraging and motivating a number of other scholars in educational research, innovation and experimentation. Before Naik's entry on the all-India educational scene in the early 1960s, educational research in India was a paltry, miserable, imitative affair, confined mostly to construction and modification of achievement tests in schools. During the last three decades it has considerably ramified and diversified, has grown richer and more relevant, and is now one hopes, on the road to maturity. The major share of the credit in this respect undoubtedly goes to Naik's own tireless efforts and his knack of lobbying and persuading others to undertake similar endeavours.

Naik was in constant touch with developing educational thought all over the world and he exposed Indian educationists to these ideas. Conversely, by his participation in international educational activities, he became the authentic spokesman in those forums in the educationally backward Third World countries in general and for India and Indian education in particular. It is his wide-ranging

national activities that have been in a large measure responsible for putting India on the world educational map.

In India itself, ever since he went to the Central Ministry and particularly after the establishment of the Education Commission in 1964, his constant refrain was the fundamental reconstruction of Indian education. The massive ECR and his efforts thereafter to popularize its formulations, modifying them where necessary, were all directed towards this single objective. Except for some minor issues, he failed in this grand objective, but it was none the less a magnificent failure. The present analysis has pointed out the inherent weaknesses in his conceptual edifice but, irrespective of them, the failure was embedded in the very socio-structural forces of the Indian situation. Had he adopted in the very beginning the approach to which he arrived towards the end of his life, his thinking would no doubt have become more precise, more consistent. That would have hardly been acceptable, however, to the Education Commission and the powers that be, or for that matter to the wide audience he usually attracted!

Naik's efforts have achieved one purpose. Like the post-independence slogans about 'socialism' and 'socialistic pattern', his writings have induced in many Indian educationists, politicians and educational planners and administrators the use of radical phraseology in education.

Whatever his achievements and failures, Naik's departure from the Indian educational scene has a large void which cannot easily be filled. In a sense, it was the end of an epoch. It is for the on-going generations of Indian educationists to work for his idea of radical reconstruction of Indian education with a clearer perspective.

Notes

1. This article was first published in *Prospects*, Vol. 13, No. 2, 1983, pp. 259-64.
2. Dates for references are those given in the select bibliography below.

A select bibliography of works by J. P. Naik

by Jandhyala B. G. Tilak

The entries are arranged in chronological order; under each year first books and then articles are presented, each in alphabetical order.

1941. *Report on Wastage and Stagnation in Primary Schools*. Bombay, Provincial Board of Primary Education.

1942*a*. *History of the Local Fund Cess (Devoted to Education) in the Province of Bombay 1839-1937*. Bombay, Local Self-Government Institute.

1942*b*. *Studies in Primary Education*. Bombay, Local Self-Government Institute.

1945. *History of Education in India during the British Period (1800-1947)*. Bombay, Macmillan. (Jointly with Syed Nurullah.) (Revised edition, 1951.)

1948. Educational Research in the Province of Bombay. *Progress of Education*, Vol. 23, Nos. 9-12, pp. 283-85.

1949. The Language Problem in Filipino Education. *Journal of Education and Psychology* (Gujarat), Vol. 6, No. 4, pp. 163-71.
1952*a*. *Compulsory Education in India.* Paris, UNESCO. (Jointly with K. G. Saiyidain and S. Hussain Abid).
1952*b*. *Training of Educational Administrators.* New Delhi, Ministry of Education, Government of India, 1952. (Studies in Education and Psychology)
1952*c*. The Janata College: A New Concept. *Education Quarterly* (New Delhi), Vol. 4, No. 4, pp. 91-98.
1952*d*. Some Problems of Single Teacher Schools. *Education Quarterly* (New Delhi), Vol. 4, pp. 21-27.
1953*a*. *Research and Experiments in Rural Education.* New Delhi, Ministry of Education, Government of India. (Studies in Education and Psychology.)
1953*b*. *The Single Teacher School.* New Delhi, Ministry of Education, Government of India. (Studies in Education and Psychology.) (3rd edition, 1963.)
1955. Education in Bombay Against an All-India Background. *Progress of Education*, Vol. 30, No. 3, pp. 74-77.
1957. (ed.) *Educational Writings of R. V. Parulekar.* Bombay, Asia Publishing House.
1958. *Review of Education in Bombay State 1855-1955.* Bombay, Education Department, Government of Maharashtra.
1960*a*. Provision of School Places in Classes I to V. *Education Quarterly* (New Delhi), Vol. 12, pp. 18-20.
1960*b*. The Village Panchayats and Primary Education. *Indian Journal of Adult Education* (New Delhi), Vol. 21, No. 6, pp. 9-11.
1961*a*. *Agra University Extension Lectures.* Agra, Agra University.
1961*b*. (ed.) *The Indian Yearbook of Education 1961: First Yearbook of Education.* New Delhi, National Council of Educational Research and Training. (Revised edition, 1965.)
1961*c*. *The Role of the Government of India in Education.* New Delhi, Ministry of Education, Government of India. (Reprinted 1963.)
1961*d*. Review of Education in India, 1947-61. *The Indian Yearbook of Education 1961: First Yearbook of Education*, pp. 220-77. New Delhi, National Council of Educational Research and Training. (Revised edition, 1965.)
1962. Educational Planning in Asia. *Indian Journal of Adult Education* (New Delhi), Vol. 23, No. 3, pp. 7-10.
1963. (ed.) *Development of University Education 1860-87: Selections from the Educational Records of the Government of India.* Delhi, Manager of Publications, Ministry of Education.
1964*a*. *Long-term Educational Reconstruction in India.* Calcutta, Indian Committee for Cultural Freedom.
1964*b*. A Perspective Plan for the Development of Elementary Education in India. *The Indian Yearbook of Education: The Second Yearbook*, pp. 565-618. New Delhi, National Council of Educational Research and Training.
1964*c*. Ancillary Services. *The Indian Yearbook of Education: The Second Yearbook*, pp. 376-89. New Delhi, National Council of Educational Research and Training.
1964*d*. Elementary Teachers in India – A Historical Review, 1800-1961. *The Indian Yearbook of Education: The Second Yearbook*, pp. 219-37. New Delhi, National Council of Educational Research and Training.
1964*e*. *Financing of Education in India.* New Delhi, Education Commission, 1964.
1964*f*. Objectives, Curricula and Methods of Teaching, 1800-1937. *The Indian Yearbook of Education: The Second Yearbook*, pp. 41-57. New Delhi, National Council of Educational Research and Training.

1964*g*. Research on Elementary Education. *The Indian Yearbook of Education: The Second Yearbook*, pp. 414-32. New Delhi, National Council of Educational Research and Training.

1964*h*. The Role of the Central, State and Local Governments and Voluntary Agencies. *The Indian Yearbook of Education: The Second Yearbook*, pp. 437-51. New Delhi, National Council of Educational Research and Training.

1964*i*. *Some Lessons of the Indian Experience in Educational Planning (1964-1966)*. New Delhi: Ministry of Education, Government of India. Paper presented at the Seminar on Methodology and Techniques of Educational Planning at the Central Institute of Education (University of Delhi).

1965*a*. *Educational Planning in India*. Bombay, Allied Publishers Private Ltd.

1965*b*. Enrolment Policies in Indian Education. *Manpower Journal* (New Delhi), Vol. 1, No. 1, pp. 56-114.

1965*c*. *Grants-in-Aid to Colleges of Arts and Science and Secondary Schools*. New Delhi, Educational Commission. (Task Force on Educational Administration, Monograph No. 3.)

1965*d*. *Grants in Aid to Educational Institutions in India: A Comparative Study of Rules to Grants-in-Aid to Colleges of Arts and Science, Secondary, Middle and Primary Schools*. New Delhi, Educational Commission. (Task Force on Educational Administration, Monograph No. 2.)

1965*e*. Objectives of Educational Development. *Manpower Journal* (New Delhi), Vol. 1, No. 2, pp. 96-126.

1965*f*. *Review of Private Enterprise in Education*. New Delhi, Education Commission. (Task Force on Educational Administration, Monograph No. 5.)

1965*g*. *Status of Private Enterprise in Indian Education in the Post-Independence Period*. New Delhi, Education Commission. (Task Force on Educational Administration, Monograph No. 1.)

1966*a*. *Education and National Development: Report of the Education Commission 1964-1966*. New Delhi, Ministry of Education, Government of India. (Member-Secretary)

1966*b*. *Elementary Education in India: The Unfinished Business*. Bombay, Asia Publishing House.

1967*a*. *A Historical Review of Educational Planning in India*. Beirut, Lebanon. (Paper presented at the Round Table Conference on 'The Role of Educational Planning in the Economic Development of the Arab World', 19-28 February 1967.)

1967*b*. The Role and Problem of Private Enterprise in Education. *The Christian College and National Development*, pp. 123-35. Madras, Christian Literature Society.

1968*a*. *Education in the Fourth Plan: Review and Perspective*. Bombay, Nachiketa Publications.

1968*b*. Broad-based Planning Process Consisting of Integrated Plans at the Institutional, District, State and National Levels. *Education Quarterly* (New Delhi), Vol. 20, No. 1, pp. 17-19.

1968*c*. Educational Administration in Urban Areas. *Indian Journal of Public Administration* (New Delhi), Vol. 14, No. 3, pp. 736-45.

1968*d*. Exchange of Teachers in India. *NIE Journal* (NCERT, New Delhi), Vol. 3, No. 1, pp. 61-63.

1968*e*. Review of the Achievements of the First Three Five Year Plans (1951-1965). *Education Quarterly* (New Delhi), Vol. 19, No. 4, pp. 33-39.

1968*f*. Role of Teachers in Educational Planning and Development. *Naya Shikshak: Teacher Today*, Vol. 11, No. 2, pp. 58-72.

1969*a*. *Educational Planning in a District*. New Delhi, Asian Institute for Educational Planning and Administration (now known as the National Institute of Educational Planning and Administration).

1969*b*. *Institutional Planning*. New Delhi, Asian Institute for Educational Planning and Administration (now known as the National Institute of Educational Planning and Administration).

1969*c*. Educational Planning in a Poor Country. *Quest* (Bombay), Vol. 60, January—March, pp. 42-57.

1970. Union-State Relations in Education: Their Implication for Educational Administration. *Indian Journal of Public Administration* (New Delhi), Vol. 16, No. 3, pp. 378-84.

1971*a*. *Education of the Scheduled Castes 1965-66*. New Delhi, Indian Council of Social Science Research. (Occasional Monograph, No. 6.)

1971*b*. *Education of the Scheduled Tribes 1965-66*. New Delhi, Indian Council of Social Science Research. (Occasional Monograph, No. 5.)

1971*c*. *Role, Responsibilities, Function, Programmes and Organisation of the ICSSR: A Policy Statement and a Special Report*. New Delhi, Indian Council of Social Science Research. (Occasional Monograph, No. 7.)

1972*a*. *Access, Structure, and Quality in Higher Education: Some Suggestions for Reorganization*. Prasarnagar, Mysore, University of Mysore. (Princess Lilavathi Memorial Lectures.)

1972*b*. Crash Programme for the Education of Out-of-School Youth in the Age-Group 14-21. *Convergence* (Toronto), Vol. 5, No. 1, pp. 27-36.

1972*c*. Education in Free India. *Progress of Education* (Pune), Vol. 47, No. 2, pp. 42-44.

1972*d*. Higher Education in India: Some Suggestions for Reorganization. *New Frontiers in Education* (New Delhi), Vol. 2, No. 1, pp. 6-21.

1972*e*. Vocationalisation of Secondary Education: Brief Historical Survey. *Rajasthan Board Journal of Education* (Ajmer), Vol. 8, No. 4, pp. 1-6.

1973*a*. The Idea of an Autonomous College. *New Frontiers in Education* (New Delhi), Vol. 3, No. 1, pp. 37-38.

1973*b*. The New Indian Programme: Science and Technology for Development. *Minerva* (London), Vol. 11, pp. 537-70.

1974*a*. *The Search for a National System of Education: The Indian Experience*. New Delhi, Indian Council of Social Science Research.

1974*b*. *A Student's History of Education in India 1800-1973*. Bombay, Macmillan. (Jointly with Syed Nurullah.) (Sixth Revised Edition.)

1974*c*. Some Aspects of Post-Independence Development in India. Sambalpur, Sambalpur University. (Lal Bahadur Shastri Memorial Lectures.)

1975*a*. *Elementary Education in India: A Promise to Keep*. Bombay, Allied Publishers Private Ltd.

1975*b*. *Equality, Quality and Quantity: The Elusive Triangle in Indian Education*. Bombay, Allied Publishers Private Ltd. (Tagore Memorial Lectures.)

1975*c*. *Policy Performance in Indian Education 1947-1974*. New Delhi, Orient Longman, 1975. (Dr K. G. Saiyidain Memorial Lectures.)

1975*d*. Educational Planning in India. *Bulletin of the UNESCO Regional Office for Education in Asia* (Bangkok), Vol. 16, pp. 1-19.

1975*e*. Functional Primary School. *Literary Discussion* (Tehran), Vol. 6, No. 2, pp. 79-96.

1976*a*. Political Content of Education. In: *Political Content of Education*, pp. 1-16. (Edited by A. R. Kamat.) Calcutta, Socio-Research Publications Centre.

1976*b*. The Search for a National System of Education: The Indian Experience. *Prospects* (Paris, UNESCO), Vol. 6, No. 2, pp. 196-208.

1976*c*. Some Perspectives on Non-Formal Education. *Indian Journal of Adult Education* (New Delhi), Vol. 37, No. 10, pp. 2-9.

1977*a*. *Alternative System of Health Care Services in India: Some Proposals.* Bombay, Allied Publishers Private Ltd.

1977*b*. *Selections from Educational Records of the Government of India.* Vol. 1: *Development of Educational Service*, 1859-1879. (Edited jointly with S. C. Ghosh.) New Delhi, Sterling.

1977*c*. *Selections from Educational Records of the Government of India.* Vol. 2: *Development of University Education, 1916-1920.* (Edited jointly with S. C. Ghosh.) New Delhi, Sterling.

1977*d*. *Some Perspectives on Non-Formal Education.* Bombay, Allied Publishers Private Ltd. (Zakir Hussain Memorial Lectures, 1976.)

1977*e*. Universal Elementary Education. *New Frontiers in Education* (New Delhi), Vol. 7, No. 3, pp. 91-97.

1978*a*. *Education for Our People: A Policy Frame for the Development of Education (1978-87) (for the Citizens for Democracy).* Bombay, Allied Publishers Private Ltd.

1978*b*. *Educational Reform in India: A Historical Review.* New Delhi, Orient Longman. (R. B. R. R. Kale Memorial Lectures.)

1978*c*. Action Programme to Liquidate Illiteracy. *Kurukshetra* (New Delhi), Vol. 22, No. 22, pp. 10-20.

1978*d*. Adult Education. *Yojana* (Delhi), Vol. 22, No. 12, pp. 29-30.

1978*e*. To Begin a Revolution with a Revolution. *The Social Context of Education: Essays in Honour of Professor J. P. Naik,* pp. 1-13. Bombay, Allied Publishers Private Ltd.

1979*a*. Perspective of Formal and Non-Formal Education. *Journal of Workers' Education* (Nagpur), Vol. 14, No. 2, pp. 1-8.

1979*b*. Quality, Equality and Quantity: The Elusive Triangle in Indian Education. *International Review of Education* (Hamburg), Vol. 25, Nos. 2-3, pp. 167-85. (Reprinted in: L. Fernig and J. Bowen (eds.). *Twenty Five Years of Educational Practice and Theory 1955-1979,* pp. 41-59. Hague, Martinus Nijhoff, 1980.)

1979*c*. A Quick Appraisal of the National Adult Educational Programmes in Gujarat. *Indian Journal of Adult Education* (New Delhi), Vol. 40, No. 2, pp. 1-4.

1979*d*. Three Channels of Education in Developing Countries: Some Needed Reforms. *Indian Journal of Adult Education* (New Delhi), Vol. 40, No. 5, pp. 1-6.

1980. *An Assessment of Educational Reform in India and Lessons for the Future.* Paris, UNESCO, 1980. (Reflections on the Future Development of Education Series.)

1981. Non-Formal Education in India: A Retrospect and a Prospect. In: A. B. Shah and Susheela Bhan. *Non-Formal Education and the NAEP,* pp. 223-40. Delhi, Oxford University Press.

1982*a*. *The Education Commission and After.* New Delhi, Allied Publishers Private Ltd.

1982*b*. An Alternative System of Health Care Services in India: Some General Considerations. *Indian Institute of Education Bulletin* (Pune), Vol. 3, pp. 21-41. (The Sir Lakshmanswami Mudaliar Oration.)

1982*c*. Education and Rural Development. In: Jandhyala B. G. Tilak (ed.). *National Seminar on Education and Rural Development: Seminar Papers.* Pune, Indian Institute of Education.

1982*d*. Educational Development in India During the Next Twenty Years: 1981-2000. *Indian Institute of Education Bulletin* (Pune), Vol. 3, pp. 12-20. (The Duhr Memorial Lecture.)

1983*a*. *Selections from Educational Records of the Government of India.* Vol. 2: *Development of University Education, 1860-87.* New Delhi, National Institute of India.

1983*b*. Relevance of Education to Development Especially in Rural Areas. In: J. Veera Raghavan (ed.). *Education and the New International Order*, pp. 65-74. New Delhi, Concept.

Works about J. P. Naik

Bhandarkar, S. S. 'J. P.: Rare Person.' *Indian Institute of Education Bulletin* (Pune), Vol. 3, 1982, pp. 97-103.

Chickermane, D. V. 'J. P. Naik and the Mouni Vidyapeeth.' *Indian Institute of Education Bulletin* (Pune), Vol. 3, 1982, pp. 53-65.

Deshpande, P. L. 'Naik Saheb.' *The Social Context of Education: Essays in Honour of Professor J.P. Naik*, pp. 14-26. Bombay, Allied Publishers Private Ltd., 1978.

Hebur, K. S. 'J. P. Naik: Some Glimpses.' *Indian Institute of Education Bulletin* (Pune), Vol. 3, 1982, pp. 66-70.

Joshi, B. 'J. P. Naik: The Kolhapur Days.' *Indian Institute of Education Bulletin* (Pune), Vol. 3, 1982, pp. 42-52.

'J. P. Naik: Rebel, Scholar and Administrator.' *Indian Institute of Education Bulletin* (Pune), Vol. 3, 1982, pp. 1-11.

Kamat, A. R. 'The Pilgrim's Progress.' *Indian Institute of Education Bulletin* (Pune), Vol. 3, 1982, pp. 104-18.

Khair, G. S. 'J. P. Naik: An Incorrigible Idealist.' *Indian Institute of Education Bulletin* (Pune), Vol. 3, 1982, pp. 119-21.

Panandikar, S. 'J. P. Naik as I Knew Him.' *Indian Institute of Education Bulletin* (Pune), Vol. 3, 1982, pp. 77-84.

Shah, A. B. (ed.). *The Social Context of Education: Essays in Honour of Professor J. P. Naik*. Bombay, Allied Publishers Private Ltd., 1978.

Sundaram, N. K. 'J. P. Naik at the Union Ministry of Education: 1959-1978.' *Indian Institute of Education Bulletin* (Pune), Vol. 3, 1982, pp. 71-76.

ALEXANDER SUTHERLAND NEILL

(1883–1973)

Jean-François Saffange

The death of A. S. Neill on 23 September 1973 went almost unrecorded in the newspapers, yet it marked the end of the saga of Summerhill, his little school in Suffolk, United Kingdom, and set the seal on the disregard or even rejection of a man who had come to symbolize a decade of nonconformist fervour.

A Radical Approach to Child Rearing (1960), a best-seller in the 1960s, had made Summerhill a centre of avant-garde libertarian education and placed Neill at the very heart of a heated educational controversy. Even when the most indignant protests and accusations of child corruption were being voiced, pupils and visitors flocked to this centre.

This somewhat disturbing enthusiasm met with success, though oddly enough it failed to make Neill famous. Little is generally known of the daily life of the school or of the fact that Summerhill is above all the story of an educator's long-lasting dream, a dream made of generosity, vulnerability and naivety, a dream with which all those involved in education can identify.

The pioneer of the 1920s

When he was discovered in the 1960s, Neill was very soon classed as a disciple of Reich. The two men were indeed very close, but it should not be forgotten that the work of Neill must first be seen in terms of exceptional educational longevity. When he died at the age of 90, Neill had spent most of his life in the classroom: as pupil, as pupil-teacher with his father, as teacher and then as head-master. Any influences that exist thus go back much earlier in the century. Neill was hardly recognized for what he was, that is, above all the last survivor of the New Education movement which flourished at the turn of the century. Time in any case had already taken its toll of these adventurous years of education, leaving a trace only of the leading figures and passing over the extraordinary proliferation of research discoveries and idealistic theories (Medici, 1962, p. 8).

From this point of view, the English-speaking branch, where Neill had found his own special place, was by no means the least flourishing.

It is not generally known that in 1920 he ran the review *New Era* with the theosophist Beatrice Ensor, thus becoming a close observer of a wide variety of experiments and achievements and promoting the spread of new ideas, not hesitating to act as an ardent and more than partial propagandist. In those years, Neill was already, in the words of Adolphe Ferrière, the '*enfant terrible* of extremist educational ideas in England' (Ferrière, 1922, p. 384). A reader of Freud, whose ideas he used skilfully to deride his colleagues, a fierce adversary of Maria Montessori, already an eminent educational theorist, whom he accused of having an over-scientific and moralistic approach, Neill sowed the seeds of controversy and provoked 'much indignation and courage' (Hemmings, 1972, p. 35), until his ultimate exclusion from the review. Nor is it widely known that he attended the Calais Congress, where he met Decroly, Ferrière and all the leading pioneers, leaving his mark as the author of avant-garde works.

He became better known after the First World War through the success of his first book *A Dominie's Log* (1915); but above all he liked to think of himself as the spiritual son of Homer Lane, another figure of the English movement, the founder of the Little Commonwealth, an establishment of young delinquents run on the principle of self-government. Homer Lane, of American origin, had learned to be an educator in the United States at the George Junior Republic. Attacked for his practices, Lane put up a clumsy defence and was forced to leave England. Neill saw in him his first martyr. Reich was to be the second.

Summerhill

Neill opened his first school in 1922 during a journey through Europe, but he founded Summerhill, near Leiston, in England, in 1924. The little school existed for decades without a change. Through some twenty books and countless articles, he related the daily life of the school, never missing an opportunity to provoke argument, repeatedly describing a place in which the adult had not imposed his will, a place for play where total disorder reigned.

A great deal of the damage done to the school was done by the children: 'The wear and tear of materials in Summerhill is a natural process . . . and if a boy needs a piece of metal for a boat keel, he will use my expensive tools if one of them happens to be about the right size' (1962, pp. 33, 131). Journalists called Summerhill the 'do-as-you-please-school' (Hemmings, 1972, p. 140). Many of the visitors indeed saw the school as 'a Kafkaesque universe with dilapidated and sometimes vandalized buildings' (Vallotton, 1976, p. 9). Yet the school, with its wooden buildings, its large park and trees, seemed, especially in summer, one of the most pleasant of places, a real country school such as Ferrière dreamed of at the beginning of the century.

In this school, however, lessons were optional. The children could play all day if they so wished, or do handicrafts in the workshop. The evenings were set

aside for dancing, theatre and entertainment. If it had not been for the threat of the school being closed by the authorities, Neill would have placed no ban on sexual relations.

Friday evening was set aside for the general assembly. During that meeting, which was chaired by an elected pupil, the children explained their problems and discussed them, working out their own rules. In this assembly, Neill's vote, like that of the other adults, had no greater weight than that of a pupil. This, says Neill, was the secret of the success of an educational technique learnt through contact with Homer Lane.

The originality, the provocation and success of the founder's books were not always sufficient to protect the school from the risk of closure. After the Second World War, there was a dangerous decrease in the number of pupils and the Summerhill Society had to be founded in order to save the school. The education authorities never really accepted it. When they went back on their decision to close the school, some, as Hemmings (1972, p. 140) noted, interpreted this not so much as a mark of recognition as a kind of tolerance of 'a mere relic'. Yet it was this same relic which, several years later, was to prove too small to take in all the pupils and visitors.

The libertarian impulse

Neill was neither a scientist nor a researcher, perhaps a philosopher, but above all a dreamer and idealist. He did not belong to one specific educational or psychological school of thought and he never developed a methodical, well-thought-out approach. His whole work was merely an extension of his own personality. Although a prolific writer, what he wrote was often no more than outbursts of enthusiasm, vehement assertions, anecdotes and indignant reactions, but also, it must be admitted, over-simplified arguments. He never troubled to present his ideas in a logical sequence nor to ascertain whether they corresponded to reality. As Bates-Ames (1978) put it, 'Neill constructs a theory of how a child thinks, and what he thinks the child needs, and even when that theory is refuted by all the objective evidence, he still insists on treating children as if they were as he imagined them to be.' In fact Neill, unlike his contemporaries, never approached educational problems in terms of needs but in terms of rights. Even when he borrowed the term of 'self-regulation' from Reich, it was to say that it meant 'the right of a baby to live freely without outside authority in things psychic and somatic' (1953, p. 42). This explains why the theories of the time were often distorted and were only used as a vehicle for his own ideas. Later in life, he was still surprised to have written for years without having succeeded in clarifying his beliefs and actions.

'Freedom in a school is simply doing what you like so long as you do not spoil the peace of others' – that sums up the principle of freedom that prevailed at Summerhill. Its application in educational terms is simple: 'in psychic health we should impose nothing and in learning we should demand nothing' (1945,

p. 103). In fact, Neill's educational project was complete by 1914 before he had ever read a single educational treatise: 'These bairns . . . have done what they liked. . . . I know that I have brought out all their innate goodness' (1915, pp. 217-18). All his books and articles are simply variations on this theme and his contacts were all used first and foremost to confirm that theme rather than enrich it. This principle is the reflection of a true libertarian impulse which came straight from childhood.

The resolute individualist

Neill did not emerge from childhood – one spent in the shadow of Calvin – unscathed. He was long to remember the moments of happiness spoilt by the endless threat of divine retribution, the fear of sin, the fear of dying unshriven. This fear was inculcated less by the Church than by family life: 'We were not specifically taught religion; it was in the air . . . an atmosphere of negation of life' (1972*a*, p. 44). In this large family, between a distant mother and a father who had little esteem for him, the young Alexander did not seem to have found the love he needed, the love he so successfully gave his own pupils.

This childhood turned him into a resolute individualist. 'He was the kind of fellow who would paint his bicycle blue when everyone else's was black' (Hemmings, 1972, p. 3). At school he was indeed a solitary child, a misfit, finding in this his stability, his strength and his weakness. He sought to make his pupils into people who did not passively follow the crowd but were self-reliant, holding their own opinions, capable of self-assertion. His need for independence was not without a certain taste for excess and provocation, laying the stakes on man: 'The one thing that will save the people is individualism . . . your country needs you . . . to set it right', he said to each of his pupils in 1915 (1915, pp. 146, 175). For the freedom which he offered his pupils aimed at nothing less than making them into people who would live to serve others: 'We want to turn out men and women who will rapidly join the conventional crowd and help it to reach better ideals' (1920, p. 70). This is where education comes into the picture: 'it must help a child to live its cosmic life fully, to live for others, for every human is egocentric, selfish' (1920, p. 128).

Neill emerged from this childhood with an unquenchable hatred of all religious teaching and any imposition of values, whatever their form. His view of the traditional school with its system of corporal punishment, or the New School based on the Coué method, for example, added fuel to the flames, and if psychoanalysis was ever useful to him it was because it provided him with the means of dissecting it. Neill sought only to appeal to the child's intelligence and spirit of decision. Because he was not a subtle man, his observation of social reality confirmed his view that any attempt at moralism is motivated by a desire for domination. This aroused his interest in Reich's studies on the psychic structure of the masses shaped by sexual repression. It led to his refusal ever to transmit any value: 'I never attempt to get children to share my beliefs or my prejudices'

(1960, p. 224). 'I do not see what right teachers have to force children to adopt what they consider to be in good taste', he would often say. It was a strangely contradictory approach by which Neill glorified education while demonstrating its impossibility.

For Neill, the world was black yet at the heart of this blackness lay the inherent goodness of man. 'The general idea . . . is the conception that man is a sinner by birth and that he must be trained to be good' (1926, p. 13). For Neill, on the contrary, 'there is not, and never was, "original sin"' (1953, p. 42). Despite some cruel doubts, this faith in man was never to leave him. It balked his attempt to return to the ideas of Freud. That belief brought him near to Reich, for whom man was an 'honest creature, hard-working, co-operative, affectionate'.

Christian feelings

'I am a very religious person; what man brought up in Calvinist Scotland could fail to be?' Neill was often to say. In fact his upbringing instilled in him an exceptionally strong Christian sensitivity. On two occasions Neill wished to become a parson. These feelings were to colour his whole vision of the world and his educational project. They were already present in his first book when, commenting on Nietzsche's ideas, he notes: 'If pity and kindness are wrong, then wrong is right' (1915, p. 108). Neill dreamt of a world governed by love, a love that would establish universal harmony, a world reflecting the message of Christ, the 'original' message, that which was perverted by the evangelists (1916, p. 75). This world would come when man took time to reflect on his own act: 'I think that the foundation of true justice is self-analysis; . . . in my Utopia, self-examination will be the only examination that will matter' (1915, pp. 145-46). This was the message that Neill found again in Homer Lane, who said that each of us is the lover of all mankind and the entire world. Man is constrained to love. If he hates he is expressing love in a negative way. Neill found in this the gospel which he had sought (1972*a*, p. 137) and the experience of the Little Commonwealth was a 'Christ-like experiment to encourage me' (1916, p. 53). It was this same message that Reich sought to transmit and it is well known to what extent he identified with Christ.

To quote Hameline (1985, p. 72), Neill throughout his life 'far from being an immoralist, conducted a constantly pastoral enterprise'. Beyond its disorder, Summerhill was an eminently moral place. Neill had several reasons for writing that his pupils lived 'as honestly and as humanely as any gospel band of Christians' (1939, p. 73).

We can thus see how greatly this man who was accused of corrupting children was misunderstood. Here, however, perhaps lies the reason for his difficulty in explaining his thoughts and acts, bearing as he did a message to which his contemporaries seemed barely sensitive; obliged to seek ways of realizing it outside conventional moral principles; tempted, in order to formulate his message,

to use concepts which, taken out of context, only gave it an illusion of scientific precision. Yet Neill had his place among educators like Montessori, Ferrière and Claparède. They all placed their hopes in man and education. All were in their own way libertarians. All, according to Avanzini (1975, pp. 131-2), 'nurtured the same hope . . . that a just and generous world might be attained'.

The attractions of psychoanalysis

Neill endeavoured at first to base his libertarian educational approach on the contributions of psychoanalysis at the very time when Freud's ideas were beginning to penetrate the world of education. A 'fervent psychoanalyst' (Ferrière, 1922, p. 384), he did not hesitate from 1920 onwards to give lectures on this theory, and two years later even undertook the analysis of some of his pupils, on the strength of having just read a few books and having had a number of more than singular psychological discussions with Homer Lane. Psychoanalysis in its early stages left the door open to many vagaries. In fact, Neill was always a dilettante in this field.

The two books by Freud, the *Interpretation of Dreams* and *Psychopathology of Everyday Life*, provided him with a key to his own behaviour and that of others. He derived amusement from them but above all saw them as a justification for his theory: 'The teacher and the parson are men who hate themselves so much that they must always be preaching. But through the mechanism of protection, they see their faults in the other fellow and proceed to lead him to the binomial theorem or to salvation.' He may then conclude, since he is in the process of analysis: 'I cannot project my faults on to a class of children and I am incapacitated for teaching' (1922, p. 197-98).

Nevertheless, Neill particularly took up the ideas of traumatism and repression, terms which, when associated with that of childhood, could not fail to acquire an immense power for all-embracing explanation. Neill shared the view of his colleagues: 'The neurotic is a person whose libido or life force is bottled up . . . the boy who hates algebra and has to work examples is getting no chance whatever [to express himself]' (1920, p. 115). This view confirmed his belief that nature is good. Only education perverts it, that education of which Freud had just shown up the contradictions.

Psychoanalysis makes it possible to reveal this true nature by extending the bounds of introspection, which led Neill to say: 'I firmly believe that Freud's discovery will have a greater influence on the evolution of humanity than any discovery of the last ten centuries' (1920, p. 141). Henceforth, a world governed by love was possible. Was Christ not the man of love, of charity and of justice because he 'knew his own weakness' (1926, p. 171)? Throughout his life, Neill was to repeat that 'we might trace all the futilities, all the stupidities of mankind, all the wars and crimes and injustices to man's ignorance of himself'. Through self-knowledge, man regains that inner peace which heralds universal harmony:

'no happy man ever disturbed a meeting or preached a war or lynched a negro' (1960, p. 15).

Neill very soon ceased to read Freud. He found the concept of man as presented through psychoanalysis difficult to accept. He never refused to speak of libido, but that libido was too much threatened by what Ferrière (1922, p. 220) had called the 'dark cave' for him not to yield, like many others, to the attractions of the Jungian 'life impulse' through which the basic goodness of human nature could unfurl, with all its promise for the future. 'Freud believes in original sin' (1920, p. 24). For Neill, the life impulse very soon assumed the innocence of a 'desexualized libido' (Bigeault, 1978, p. 53) and his 'theory of sexuality . . . although unbridled, has nothing erotic or roguish about it . . . it has the crystal clarity of pure pleasure' (Mazure, 1980, p. 53). Neill simultaneously rejected the whole Freudian theory on the structure of the personality and was never to admit the existence of the Oedipus complex. Reich did not contradict him.

The doctrine of interest

Neill also based his arguments on the doctrine of interest, a key concept in the educational theories of the time. Interest was the psychological basis of the New Education movement. According to Ferrière (1922, p. 229), 'it is the lever which moves mountains . . . the keystone of the Active School'. Neill proclaimed its virtues: 'interest is the only criterion' (1922, p. 229). The similarity stops here, because although for Ferrière (1922, p. 230) 'only interest which is capable of stimulating and sustaining effort deserves the name of interest', for Neill the concept was simple and devoid of ambiguity: 'When a boy makes a snowball, he is interested. . . . I don't care what a child is doing in the way of creation, whether he is making tables, porridge or sketches . . . or snowballs . . . there is more true education in making a snowball than in listening to an hour's lecture on grammar' (1920, pp. 13-14).

There is no doubt that it was his forays into Freudian ideas that made him so sure of himself. Claparède had proposed merging interest and libido in a single concept. Neill for his part merged the two approaches with easy assurance – the approach of the psychoanalyst on the one hand and that of the educator on the other. 'The child's interest . . . is simply what he can do with all his infinite life energy' (1922, p. 229); 'interest is the life force of the whole personality' (1926, p. 152).

The waning of interest

From the educational to the psychological, the circle gradually closes. 'The aim of education is to allow emotional release so that there will be no bottling up and no future neurosis, and this release comes through interest' (1920, pp. 114-15).

Henceforth the teacher's work is simple: 'to find out where a child's interest lies and to help him to live it out'; 'my pupils never go to a lesson, it takes such faith and patience to realize that they are doing the right thing' (1945, p. 145).

It is not surprising in this context that Neill demanded the withdrawal of the educator, through whom traumatism could occur. He took up here a theme in fashion at the time, that of the comrade-teacher. Ferrière himself did not fail to praise 'the faculty of spontaneously formed social bodies . . . to bring children after a period of anarchy . . . to establish order and discipline. . . . No adult seeking to impose his authority could ever obtain what the spirit of the beehive achieves spontaneously' (Ferrière, 1950, p. 32). What in Ferrière was primarily an appeal to a silent presence soon became in Neill something like an appeal to regression. He had, as Lane had moreover taught him, to be 'one of the boys'. It should be noted that Lane, on at least one occasion, joined in quite cheerfully with the children in damaging his own school.

Thus ends this amazing balancing act between two theories which, once more after Rousseau, hold that nature is the best educator and reduce the educator to the role of preserving nature's slow but sure work. For Neill had no doubt that, through successive interests, the child was moving towards good. Without being asked to, he would learn, since it was in his nature to do so. This was to become the principle of free study. This natural harmonious development took in all aspects of the child's personality.

A different reality

It is a strange faculty of education to be able to stimulate and encourage the development of such a theory, charged as it is with so much nostalgia and so many healing projects. One can see here all Neill's passion and obstinacy, and especially his solitude, even though he was so deeply rooted in the educational trends of the period, which he caricatured. It is a theory that daily practical reality at Summerhill never succeeded in refuting. In fact, the project was designed for uninhibited, self-regulated children, but the school never had occasion to take in such children. Life at Summerhill in fact fell far short of the picture painted of it by its headmaster.

Neill's project in its simplicity calls for a few elementary reminders. We know, as Freud emphasized, that the child must learn to control his instincts and adapt to his social environment and that education must to a large extent teach him to do this. The basic human experience is in fact the experience of frustration. We also know that if the child is to develop a strong ego (which Neill sought to achieve), he needs to make contact with personalities capable both of firmness and affection, who encourage this subtle interplay of love and agressivity through which the ego is formed.

Curiously enough, in this place – the school – from which theoretically he should be excluded, the adult plays an important role, especially Neill, whose open-mindedness, human warmth, enthusiasm, opportunism and humour were

familiar to each pupil. The great freedom he granted his pupils and the trust he placed in them gained him even more respect in their eyes. Each pupil knew that, if necessary, Neill readily took firm action and imposed prohibitions in order to protect the child and the group. Every pupil knew that he was the headmaster and could resort to expulsion.

Bruno Bettelheim (1978, pp. 103-04) was right when he said:

> Neill remains unaware of why the things he does work . . . he does not face the fact that all is due to how the pupils identify with him. He does not realize that Summerhill works not because it is just the right setting in which to raise children, but because it is nothing but an extension of his personality. Everything about it expresses Neill . . . what he stands for and lives for. Everywhere there is the powerful impact of his person . . . and sooner or later most children come to identify with him, however reluctantly. He is simply one of the grandest men around.

As Mauco (1971, p. 154) points out, on account of the large number of pupils, a 'group idea may emerge and stimulate a tendency to identification'.

It is certainly this ability to be present which explains Neill's educational genius, and in this his experiment deserves consideration, even if there is a singular lack of instruments by which to examine it. Without reservations, Neill certainly loved his pupils and stood by them. This was a hazardous undertaking which often made trainee teachers an easy prey for groups of pupils. On this point Neill learnt from his experience. At the heyday of the appeal to regression and the theory that pupils should be allowed to live out their interests, he faced the phenomenon of aggressivity and learned to hear the child's demands in all their ambiguity. He learned how to respond. For at Summerhill relations moved rapidly towards therapeutic activity and the pupils could have psychological discussions if they so wished. Open-minded, observant, intuitive, playing on humour and the impact of the unexpected, Neill 'draws the pupil out of a lie in which he has got lost' (Mannoni, 1970, pp. 11-12). Better still, it was in everyday things, through a chance meeting, that a word or a sentence could help the child.

Because he had this ability to be present, Neill could recommend that the educational setting should be reduced to a minimum. Prohibitions did of course exist and the child was faced with a set of rules, many of which were the result of group decisions. Their existence did not fail to strike visitors. In that respect, however, Neill pushed the limits back as far as possible. That did not mean, incidentally, that life at Summerhill was easy. Bettelheim (1970, pp. 95) noted:

> While such an educational setting imposes few specific demands, though never trivial ones, it is really among the most demanding of educational institutions. Because such a setting demands of the child that he develop a very high degree of self-respect; and with it true respect for others. This is much harder to learn than how to automatically get to class at 9 o'clock.

From this point of view, the self-government which prevailed throughout the life of the school proved to be a strong factor in personal development and socialization. It was, in fact, one of the most valuable yet most neglected contributions of the New Education movement that Summerhill passed on to us.

Neill never ceased to marvel at it. Throughout his life he saw his pupils daring to speak out, to express opinions, to defend an idea, moving gradually from selfishness to co-operation, showing loyalty towards the group, developing a high sense of justice. As for the role of adults and of Neill himself, no one was ever taken in by this. A few mischievous remarks, a few humourous comments, were often enough to guide the debate and Neill never hesitated to intervene more firmly in order to protect the group from regression. After all, before becoming a harmonious unit, a group often experiences phenomena which children or adolescents could hardly be expected to control. There is no doubt that, thanks to Neill, this group life led to conclusions in which each could acquire a knowledge of himself/herself and of others.

Perhaps Neill thus succeeded in bringing about inner peace. Vallotton (1976, p. 11) was indeed 'astonished at the truth and clarity in the pupil's looks and conversation'.

That was his success. Free study was his failure. In fact, he was never really interested in teaching as such. The methods were left to the discretion of the teachers and were chiefly acknowledged to be traditional.

Between dream and reality

Here, then, is Summerhill reduced to its human dimension, with all its richness on the one hand and its vulnerability and shortcomings on the other, for there is no lack of reservations on the subject. In the 1960s, there was much questioning of the consistency of Neill's thinking but also, and above all, of the revolutionary significance of the project. On this last point, Snyders (1973), for example, never doubted that a purely psychological approach to social problems, such silence from the teacher, such a breach between the school and the outside world, could only lead to the narrowest conservatism. These reservations turned into rejection when it was seen that the school existed primarily by taking in children whose social background meant that schooling was not a great concern, and above all because of the charisma of its founder. This was a reality which Neill, too involved in explaining his educational views, endeavouring to reconcile his beliefs and his actions, would not have wished to admit, leaving the critics to sweep away everything of value that the venture had produced.

This was the creation of a place where the child felt loved, respected and understood. In his own way and to some extent despite himself, Neill rehabilitated the educator, that controversial character on the educational scene, which the fierce individualism of our times has struck out of the educational treatises, as if it still needed to be proved that educational success depends largely on the personality of the teachers, their enthusiasm and commitment. There again, Neill

passes on to us something of the 1920s, something of their invigorating eccentricity.

Strangely enough, however, it was by blindly following his own path that Neill sustained enthusiasm, and above all his own. Throughout his life, like Lane and Reich, he had an immense admiration for Christ, and felt imbued with a mission. After the Second World War, he even thought that Summerhill was becoming the birthplace of a new civilization. He also sustained enthusiasm in others. At a time when all values were being questioned, there were many who, unaware of the reality of the school, saw in Summerhill an alternative which corresponded to their hopes. Summerhill was, and will long remain, a mythical place where, at one time, a world of love and harmony came into being.

References

Avanzini, G. 1975. *Immobilisme et novation dans l'éducation* [Inertia and Renewal in Education]. Toulouse, Privat. 318 pp.

Bates-Ames, L. 1978. (Chapter 6.) In: A. S. Neill et al. *Summerhill: For and Against*. New York, Pocket Books.

Bettelheim, B. 1978. (Chapter 8.) In: A.S. Neill et al. *Summerhill: For and Against*. New York, Pocket Books.

Bigeault, J. P. 1978. *L'illusion psychanalytique en éducation* [The Psychoanalytic Illusion in Education]. Paris, Presses Universitaires de France. 268 pp. (In collaboration with G. Terrier.)

Ferrière, A. 1922. *L'école active* [The Active School]. Neuchâtel/Geneva, Delachaux & Niestlé.

——. 1950. *L'autonomie des écoliers dans les communautés d'enfants* [The Autonomy of Pupils in Children's Communities]. Neuchâtel/Paris, Delachaux & Niestlé. 152 pp.

Hameline, D. 1985. Preface. In: Saffange, J.-F. *Libres regards sur Summerhill. L'œuvre pédagogique de A. S. Neill* [Unbiased Views of Summerhill: the Educational Work of A. S. Neill]. Bern/Frankfurt/New York, Peter Lang.

Hemmings, R. 1972. *Fifty Years of Freedom*. London, George Allen & Unwin. 218 pp.

Mannoni, M. 1970. Preface. *Libres enfants de Summerhill* [The Free Children of Summerhill]. Paris, Maspero. 326 pp.

Mauco, G. 1971. *La paternité* [Parenthood]. Paris, Éditions Universitaires. 184 pp.

Mazure, J. 1980. *Enfant à l'école, école(s) pour (l')enfant(s)* [Children at School; School(s) for Children]. Tournai, Castermann. 220 pp.

Medici, A. 1962. *L'éducation nouvelle* [New Education]. Paris, Presses Universitaires de France. 125 pp.

Saffange, J.-F. 1976. Neill et Lane. *Le Binet Simon – Bulletin de la Société Alfred Binet et Théodore Simon* (Lyons), No. 553.

——. 1980. Neill, Neill, peau de mandarine [Neill, Neill, Orange Peel]. *Le Binet Simon – Bulletin de la Société Alfred Binet et Théodore Simon* (Lyons), No. 575.

——. 1985. *Libres regards sur Summerhill. L'œuvre pédagogique de A. S. Neill*. Bern/Frankfurt/New York, Peter Lang. 216 pp.

Snyders, G. 1973. *Où vont les pédagogies non-directives?* [Where Are Non-directive Teachers Heading?]. Paris, Presses Universitaires de France. 317 pp.

Vallotton, M. 1976. 'Visites à Summerhill' [Visits to Summerhill]. *Défense de la jeunesse scolaire*. Paris, Défense de la jeunesse scolaire. (Lettre d'information, No. 48).

Works by A. S. Neill

EDUCATIONAL WORKS

1915. *A Dominie's Log*. London, Jenkins. 219 pp.
1916. *A Dominie Dismissed*. London, Jenkins. 233 pp.
1920. *A Dominie in Doubt*. London, Jenkins. 256 pp.
1922. *A Dominie Abroad*. London, Jenkins. 256 pp.
1926. *The Problem Child*. London, Jenkins. 255 pp.
1932. *The Problem Parent*. London, Jenkins. 256 pp.
1936. *Is Scotland Educated?* London, Routledge. 192 pp.
1937. *That Dreadful School*. London, Jenkins. 156 pp.
1939. *The Problem Teacher*. London, Jenkins. 192 pp.
1945. *Hearts Not Heads in the School*. London, Jenkins. 164 pp.
1949. *The Problem Family*. London, Jenkins. 158 pp.
1953. *The Free Child*. London, Jenkins. 178 pp.
1958. *Wilhelm Reich* (in collaboration with P. Ritter). New York, Ritter Press.
1960. *A Radical Approach to Child Rearing*. (Preface by E. Fromm.) New York, Hart Publishing Co. Published in the United Kingdom under the title: *Summerhill: A Radical Approach to Education*. London, Gollancz, 1962.
1966. *Freedom, Not Licence!* New York, Hart Publishing Co.
1971. *Children's Rights*. (In collaboration with L. Berg, P. Adams, M. Duane et al.). London, Elek Books. 248 pp.
1972*a*. *Neill, Neill, Orange Peel*. New York, Hart Publishing Co.
1972*b*. Preface. In: H. Snitzer, *Today Is for Children, Numbers Can Wait*. New York, Macmillan.

NOVELS AND CHILDREN'S STORIES

1919. *Booming of Bunkie*. London, Jenkins. 247 pp.
1920. *Carroty Broon*. London, Jenkins. 318 pp.
1924. *A Dominie's Five*. London, Jenkins. 256 pp.
1939. *Last Man Alive*. London, Jenkins. 255 pp.

PERIODICAL ARTICLES

Neill wrote a considerable number of articles, particularly when he worked with the University of Edinburgh journal, *The Student*, and the review *New Era* and when he contributed to the magazine *Id*. Hemmings has established the largest list.

1911/12. Editorials in *The Student*. University of Edinburgh.
1915. The Lunatic. *The New Age*. 4 February.
1919. Psycho-analysis in Industry. *The New Age*. 4 December.
1920-23. Editorials in *The New Era*.
1920. The Psychology of the Flogger. *The New Era*. Vol. 1. No. 4, October.
1921. Right and Wrong. *The New Era*. Vol. 2, No. 7, July.
1922. Education in Germany. *The New Era*. Vol. 3, No. 10, April.
1928. Summerhill. *The New Era*. Vol. 9, No. 10, April.

1929. Summerhill. *The New Era*. Vol. 10, No. 39, July.
1932. Inspection of Schools. *The New Era*. Vol. 13, No. 9, October.
1935. Authority and Freedom in Schools. *The New Era*. Vol. 16, No. 1, January.
1947. Dominie Looks at the Secondary School. *Secondary Education*. September.
1948. Love-Discipline Yes. Hate-Discipline No. *New York Times Magazine*. 7 November.
1957. Freedom and Licence. *The Times Educational Supplement*. 26 July.
1959. Why Have Exams? Culture and Futility. *The Times Educational Supplement*. 8 May.
1960. Realities of Life. *The Times Educational Supplement*. 6 May.
1960/61. My Scholastic Life. *Id*. Nos. 2 & 7. September 1960; August 1961.
1960/61. Summerhill Mistakes. *Id*. No. 10. n.d.
1960/61. A Dirty Work. *Id*. No. 11. n.d.
1963. Contribution to a Symposium on Contemporary Morality. *Twentieth Century*.
1964. Tony and the Gang (conversation with H. Parkhurst). *The Times Educational Supplement*. 8 May.
1964. Using the Extra Year. *The Times Educational Supplement*. 14 February.
1966. Radical Private Schools (conversation with M. Montessori). *This Magazine Is about Schools*. Vol. 1, No. 1, April.
1966. Corporal Punishment (conversation between A. S. Neill, M. Duane and I. Cook). *The Times Educational Supplement*. 31 May.
1966. Learning or Living. *The Times Educational Supplement*. 2 September.
1966. A Dominie Grows. *The Times Educational Supplement*. 2 September.
1966. Drama in Summerhill. *The Times Educational Supplement*. 30 December.
1967. What Shortage? (on teacher-training). *The Times Educational Supplement*. 6 January.
1967. You've Got to Be Free to Be Happy. *Evening News*. 9 August.
1968. Can I Come to Summerhill? I Hate my School. *Psychology Today*. May.
1968. All of Us Are a Part of This Sick Censorsip. *The Times Educational Supplement*. 29 March.
1968. Life Without Father. *The Times Educational Supplement*. 11 April.

Works about A. S. Neill

Croall, J. *Neill of Summerhill: The Permanent Rebel*. London, Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1983. 436 pp.
Hemmings, R. *Fifty Years of Freedom*. London, Allen & Unwin, 1972. 218 pp.
Laguillaumie, P. *Summerhill, école de la liberté* [Summerhill: School of Freedom]. In: P. Furstenau, et al. *Pédagogie: Education ou mise en condition ?*, pp. 19-37. Paris, Maspero, 1968. (Dossiers partisans, No. 39.)
Mannoni, M. Préface in: *Libres enfants de Summerhill* [The Free Children of Summerhill]. Paris, Maspéro, 1970. 326 p.
Neill, A. S. et al. *Summerhill: For and Against*. New York, Pocket Books, 1978.
Saffange, J.-F. *Libres regards sur Summerhill. L'œuvre pédagogique d'A. S. Neill* [An Unbiased Look at Summerhill: A. S. Neill's Educational Work]. (Preface by D. Hameline.) Bern/Frankfurt/New York, Peter Lang, 1985. 217 pp.
Snitzer, H. *Living at Summerhill*. New York, Collier-Books, 1963.
——. *Summerhill: A Loving World*. New York, Macmillan, 1966. 144 pp.
Walmsley, J. *Neill and Summerhill*. London, Penguin Books, 1969.

PETER NOIKOV[1]

(1868–1921)

Zhecho Atanassov

Bulgaria spent almost 500 years under Turkish domination – from 1393 to 1878 – before being liberated by Russia. Bulgarian medieval culture had reached remarkable peaks in its development but the Ottoman invasion stamped out most material and cultural values with a corresponding effect on the progress of education. This helps explain the rather late foundation of a university in Bulgaria in 1888.

Lectures in pedagogy were provided from the very beginning. Pedagogy, however, was at that time geared solely to teacher training and to offering students knowledge in the theory of education, didactics and the instructional methods they would need to join the teaching profession. Teaching work in general and the qualifications of the first lecturers were not conducive to encouraging research and developing different branches of education. Peter Noikov's founding appointment in 1900 as associate professor in the Education Department at the University of Sofia was a real breakthrough, a starting point for Bulgarian pedagogy.

The formative years

Born on 27 April 1868 in the town of Yambol, Peter Noikov was only 10 years old when Bulgaria was liberated from Turkish domination. But his memories of life under foreign oppression were to leave a lasting imprint.

Although only a child, he nevertheless worked at the Russian headquarters in his native town which facilitated his learning of the Russian language and his reading Russian literature. Once kindled, Noikov's interest in Russian writers remained strong throughout his life.

After the stabilization of the country following the war of liberation, Noikov continued his education at the secondary school at Sliven. His stay at a French boarding house in the town roused his interest in French culture. Noikov began learning French and at the age of 16 he started translating works by Émile

Zola. After studying for some time at Plovdiv, he graduated from secondary school in Sofia. Due to lack of money, Noikov had to interrupt his studies twice and work as a teacher in his home town and in Sofia. This, however, brought him into contact with teaching practices and considerably influenced his choice of profession and field of research.

Noikov's talents soon caught the attention of officials at the Ministry of Education. In 1893 he was sent to Switzerland to attend a summer course for teachers. It was there that he first touched upon the major concerns of the educational sciences and decided to devote his life to them. In the autumn of 1893 he enrolled as a student of philosophy and education at Leipzig University.

At that time Leipzig University enjoyed worldwide prestige, with famous scholars like Wundt, Paulsen, Volkelt and Stumpf among its academic staff. Noikov attended lectures by all of them.

He won a state scholarship to Berlin University, but stayed there only one semester before giving up the scholarship and returning to Leipzig to attend the lectures of his preferred professors. His ambitions prompted him to write a Ph.D. thesis which he defended successfully in 1898. In it he analysed the active principle in Jean-Jacques Rousseau's pedagogy; Volkelt was his tutor.

After his return to Bulgaria, Noikov worked for some time as a teacher in philosophic propaedeutics and German, translated Descartes' *Discourse on Method* from French and studied English on his own.

Teaching activities

Joining the University of Sofia as a newly elected associate professor, Noikov stood out among the rest of his colleagues with his brilliant erudition and agile mind. His particular concern was to ensure a close link between the theoretical instruction of students and practical work at schools. To achieve this he continuously organized visits to different schools. He dreamt of setting up a model school at the university to serve as the experimental groundwork for linking theory with practice, and he founded a research laboratory in education, didactics and child psychology. Due to a lack of paid assistants but also because it provided an opportunity for educational practice, he involved many of his students in his work, assigning them the task of conducting various surveys using the methods of observation, inquiry and experiment.

The thematic range of Noikov's research was determined above all by his teaching work. Worth noting is the exceptional variety of his lectures, which covered the following topics:

The general theory of education, with specialized courses on moral education for secondary-school students.

Didactics: the general theory of education, didactics of primary and secondary education.

Instructional methods in the humanities and natural sciences, especially philosophical propaedeutics (psychology, logic, ethics), language and literature, chemistry, natural history and geography.

The history of education, with specialized courses on education in Europe during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, the history of New Education, seminars and lectures on the educational heritage of Comenius, Rousseau, Pestalozzi and Tolstoy.[2]

The history of Bulgarian education: the first university course which systematized the Bulgarian people's main heritage in education, its practice and theory.

Comparative education, with a special emphasis on major European countries.

School organization: historical development and modern problems in the functioning of school systems.

Problems of school management and student self-management.

Child psychology, with specialized courses on adolescent psychology.

Experimental education, backed by methods of educational research and experiments in the study process.

Noikov prepared over twenty-five lecture courses on basic subjects, plus another ten specialized extra-mural courses on separate problems, for all of which he was solely responsible as a lecturer. In 1910 Dimitar Katsarov was appointed his assistant; he, however, specialized in experimental education and psychology.

Since there was no past to Bulgarian education, Noikov had to do his own research in order to provide the scientific background to his university courses. That is why his scientific publications cover an extensive area of subjects and problems.

On the national principle in education

The idea of the national character of education and education systems underlay all Noikov's research. His first lecture as associate professor at the University of Sofia indicated that all his future research would be aimed at determining the general features and specific national traits of every education oriented activity.[3] Noikov proceeded from the assumption that the notion of education essentially consists of two component parts – the universal and the national, the latter being determined by every nation's real historical development:

> If the educator has in mind the image of humankind, of the human being in general and endeavours to mould his disciple in this image, then we have a case of universal education. If the educator has in mind the image of the people to whom the child belongs, he strives to mould his students in that image. This is what we call national education.[4]

Teaching is always a combination of the universal and national goals of education. 'Every epoch has had its own universal human ideal and has aspired to achieve a supremacy of the universal principle at school.'[5]

Along with that, however, every nation has its own particularities and its unique approach to current and future tasks. Nations cannot be educated in one and the same way or have one common, immutable idea. National peculiarities acquire paramount importance in the wake of bourgeois revolutions and the growing self-awareness of nations. It is here that the idea of 'national education' emerges. 'The progress of that movement', Noikov wrote, 'is best evidenced by the epithets the school began to adorn itself with. Every nation has its own ministries of agriculture, trade, finance, defence and justice but the epithet "national" is used for schools only'.[6]

Developing this idea further, Noikov listed the reasons that necessitated the linking of universal ideals with national specificities. These included the need to cultivate in the young a feeling of belonging to the nation, of contributing to national prosperity and happiness; of adjusting educational influences to the national mentality; of utilizing national experience, which in most cases remains unidentified, to the full. Most important, children should not become 'aliens in their own homeland'.[7]

Noikov maintained that it was extremely important to learn from foreign achievements in education. The results of his practical research were reflected in his publications.[8] Mastering foreign experience should not, however, lead to underrating or ignoring local experience, Noikov claimed, because an imitation could never be as good as the original. 'We shall never make our schools like other nations' schools by imitation and plagiarism; blindly following foreign models can only lead to estranging our schools from national ideals.'[9] He concluded that 'the roots of national education are in the people themselves'.[10] The task was thus to develop further these ideas in the national system of education.

Noikov advanced the idea of the harmonious combination of universal educational values which had come down through the history and experience of all countries with the individual historical experience of every single nation.

On active education

The theory of active education occupies a central position in Noikov's educational heritage. It features in almost all his publications and forms the core of his two specialized studies, 'Active Education' (1904)[11] and *The Theory of Active Education* (1906).[12] Noikov's research was generally aimed at formulating methods for a more intensive and effective education.

'Active Education' was intended to combat the growing influence of Herbart's pedagogy in the early twentieth century which had affected both the theory and practice of education. Noikov maintained that it was necessary to encourage students' activity on an increasing scale. His views had evolved with the passage of time since his Ph.D. thesis had first dealt with this subject. Noikov found in Jean-Jacques Rousseau a reliable supporter in the battle against dogmatism and in favour of freely unfolding children's creative powers.

'Active Education' is the product of extensive research and personal meditation. According to Noikov, activity was 'the salient feature of every serious educational effort; there can be no real education without it, only mechanical accumulation of knowledge, a form of taming'.[13]

To clarify fully the concept of activity, Noikov first focused his attention on its philosophical aspects. Basing his argument on Descartes, Spinoza, Kant and other philosophers, he discovered that that concept has been used mainly in two senses: (a) metaphysical, as the effect of one psychological substance on another; and (b) psychological, as the effect of one psychological faculty on another. According to him, both views were rather unconvincing. Noikov claimed that activity includes the three main functions of human consciousness: intellect, willpower and emotions, each of them being capable of active expression and having a beneficial effect on the other two. Activity is not only the result of the interaction of intellect, willpower and emotions, but also leads to the creation of new images and notions. Psychological states can be determined as passive or active depending on the involvement of existing psychological attitudes and knowledge in the formation of new images and ideas. The motives driving a person to act in one way or another at a given moment and the emotions emerging as a result of the clash of motives can be considered as the salient features of active psychological phenomena.

It is not difficult to discover in these words Wundt's influence through his theory of apperception, the role of experience, knowledge and the psychological condition of the recipient. What is new here is that Noikov stressed the possibility for channelling the apperception process; according to him, offering learners the right to choose between several motives and actions helps them form new active elements, new active mental states.

The ideas advanced in 'Active Education' did not yet form a single system. So after the article appeared, the restless young man continued to explore new aspects of the problem. The new results were systematized in *The Theory of Active Education.*

First of all, Noikov deemed it necessary to provide a definition of the concept of education. He accepted the wider view offered by Pestalozzi: education is an all-embracing formative process. In this sense, it incorporates upringing as well. Active education, that is, the personal activity of the student in the educational process, should be approached not from the point of view of external stimuli but as a characteristic of inner psychological states:

> If an educator directly influences the pupils' mind, without involving any already established attitudes or knowledge (for instance by orders, or by handing out 'ready made' knowledge) then this is an act of passive education. If, however, the educator creates the new image in the pupil's mind through his emotions and notions, this is an act of active education.[14]

The motives determining human behaviour are a salient feature of activity. If there is only one or a few motives, then their effect is one-sided. Behaviour or

learning can be called active only when there are many motives and students have an opportunity to choose and learn the ones they prefer, accepting them as their own basis for judgement, as a consciously accepted behavioural regulator.

There are, of course, cases when a person, faced with the need to select among many motives, remains passive. This depends on the degree and intensity of the psychological state and the confrontation between the motives. Sometimes, despite the existence of personal motivation, attitudes and emotions, a person agrees to obey an instruction or order against their wishes. Then the emerging unpleasant feeling of 'being wronged' is accompanied by passivity, that is, by the need to obey the order or being forced to accept ready-made solutions or conclusions.

Noikov's desire to substantiate the need of a freer expression of the child's personality is obvious. Being mindful the early-twentieth-century tradition of control over children's thinking and behaviour, this desire to defend children's active attitudes is fully understandable and justified. Nevertheless, some critical observations are also necessary. There is an inclination to exaggerate the theoretical role of 'internal factors and stimuli' which are presented in conflict or even in contradiction with the 'external', active, responsible and guiding role of the teacher – indeed, of every educator. Educational work is naturally adjusted to the needs of the trainee, but it also contains an important element which is beyond personal needs and interests: the needs and moral requirements of society, of the organized social environment. Freedom in choosing motives is not an abstraction but is determined by socially expedient requirements whose fulfilment is imperative. It does not rule out freely made decisions, but it does contain requirements to obey orders and instructions. As a principle of education and upbringing, activity cannot but conform to the intellectual and moral requirements valid in every society. If it does not observe them, education may lose its role as a pedagogical process.

Nevertheless, Noikov's defence of active education deserves a fair assessment. It should be kept in mind that Herbart's educational theories were reigning supreme in European schools at that time. There was a need to defend theoretically children's rights to a more active involvement in the study process, and thus also to make some changes in practical work. Noikov was guided in his work by evidently noble and humane motives.

On teachers

The theory of active education by necessity leads to the image of the teacher, to teacher training, to personal qualities and attitudes.

The outcomes of educational work depend to the greatest possible extent on the training of teachers, which guarantees the success of the educational process. A major requirement is to master educational theory thoroughly and to link it with existing school practices. Removing theory from practice can have a negative effect on theory itself:

A professor who has not included school practice in his course on educational theory is prone to abstract speculation. . . . And the students attending such a course will benefit too little from it: first, because the things they will hear will not be applicable and, second, even if applicable, the theories will be easily forgotten unless illustrated in practice in schools, and will be of little importance for their future work.[15]

To carry out his intentions, Noikov drafted a detailed plan guaranteeing a close link between theoretical training and school practices. According to this plan,[16] two secondary schools were to open at the university, a boys' and a girls' school, where student-teachers could carry out their practicals. The headmaster and the teachers would all be assistant professors at the university, and members of the educational faculty would be involved in research work. Educational research laboratories would be set up at the secondary schools.

Formulated in the early twentieth century, this idea was only partially materialized only after Noikov's death, with the setting up in 1923 of a Training Institute at the Third Model Boys' Secondary School.

Teacher training, in Noikov's opinion, does not end upon graduation. Teachers should be concerned with the continuous improvement of their qualifications because their authority depends upon their scientific and educational training. Even if highly talented, a teacher must continually enrich his or her knowledge, examine his or her achievements and assess them in a critical vein.

Of particular importance is the educational postulate of 'love' or involvement. It calls first of all for the teachers' interest for their own profession. It is this concern that makes them go on searching for new methods and to strive to improve their qualifications. Involvement has another aspect too; this is the teacher's concern for the students. This encourages teachers to be considerate, tactful and fair in their relationships with students, and to be concerned about their progress and the formation of moral attitudes. Teachers, however, should strive to merit their students' respect too, for it is of paramount importance not only in creating a quiet and pleasant emotional atmosphere, but for inciting the students' interest and commitment to the subject taught by the teacher. This, in turn, is a prerequisite for better intellectual achievements.

Noikov tested his theoretical requirements in his own teaching practice. Meticulous in preparing his lessons, he showed exceptional consideration and concern for his students, setting an example of what an educator should be.

About children

To focus the students' attention on the object of education – children – Noikov formed a working group of young enthusiastic researchers at the Laboratory of Didactics and Child Psychology, with whose help he conducted a wide-ranging survey on Bulgarian schoolchildren's sexual maturation. Assistant Professor Dimitar Katsarov was also involved in the work. Following continuous research over a decade, the study appeared in 1919.[17] The book presents the survey

results and reveals the orientation of scientific research, aimed at collecting more objective information about Bulgarian children in order to ensure better and more effective educational actions.

The preface defines the survey's goals: to study comparatively the physiological and psychological peculiarities of boys and girls at the age of puberty. Comparisons are made with data and results provided by French, German, British and other authors to define the general characteristics and specific features of Bulgarian children.

Reviewing in detail the methods used hitherto, Noikov discovered that most of the authors relied on students who had been asked to remember the symptoms of the onset of puberty. However, he found that this method of collecting information lacked credibility and used only his 'method of the established case', in his own definition. This method calls for establishing the percentage of students with such symptoms without asking them any questions. Instances of false information are thus eliminated because memories cannot be trusted to be fully reliable.

Noikov's method is characterized by several elements: an equal number of boys and girls polled (forty of each sex), all Bulgarian and from the same social background. 'We wanted them to be all city-dwellers, i.e. their parents lived in a town, they all came from the middle classes, i.e. they were neither very poor nor very rich, nor were they suffering from any disease.'[18] Other aspects of the selection policy included the requirement for the children's birth date to fall in the first half of the year and the poll to take place in September and October. These strict requirements ruled out the possibility for any great deviation. But they also created certain difficulties: at a high school with 1,000 pupils only a dozen children met the requirements. Still, in the interest of authenticity, the method was strictly observed, which guaranteed high-quality results.

In this study, as in all his work, Noikov proved to be an extremely exacting scholar, meticulous about the trustworthiness of results, clear in formulating the hypothesis and critical of his own achievements. The study is accompanied by a great number of tables and diagrams, meticulously calculated percentages and conscientious references to foreign literature. This study is an authentic document about the physiological development and psychological features of Bulgarian children during the second decade of the twentieth century.

Interest in the educational classics

Noikov had strong and lasting interests in the educational classics. His Ph.D. thesis already indicated his admiration for the prestige and views of one of the most remarkable educationists of all time, Jean-Jacques Rousseau. Noikov returned to Rousseau over and over again, to draw on his works for wisdom and inspiration. Whenever he faced a difficult problem, Noikov turned to the classical educational heritage. His historical research, however, always reflected a

strong feeling for current values. He sought and discovered past ideas formulated by people from previous epochs which could serve human progress.

This makes his approach to historical research extremely interesting. As a rule, he endeavoured to analyse above all the circumstances in which a certain educator had worked and the tasks he had set himself in clarifying the major educational problems of his time.

On different occasions he analysed the development of educational theory in different societies. Ancient societies were dominated by political and religious despotism. Human activity was concentrated on the struggle against oppression. This was reflected in education too: 'There is no such freedom in the Eastern societies. Science is a mystery there, accessible only to a chosen few.'[19] That is why educationists who cared about human rights strove for the unfolding of the active principle in education, unleashing the energy of every child. Educators in the ancient East knew and recommended no other method of instruction but the one based on punishment and fear. The great philosopher Socrates advanced the maieutic method which is incompatible with 'fear and violence, and requires active thinking and behaviour'.[20]

Noikov analysed in detail ideological movements and the views of humanistic educationists in particular against the backdrop of the struggle between despotism and life's call for boosting human activity and overall historical and cultural development. 'The ideal of humanistic pedagogy is no longer the single individual confined to cultural or religious activities but an individual who can display his talents in all fields.'[21] Noikov appraised highly Mafeo Vegio's humanistic views, which, proceeding from a democratic position, sought ways and means of fully integrating children into an environment in which all people should live, cherishing optimistic ideas about life and human existence. Students' activity should be encouraged in order to ensure children's all-round physical and intellectual development. Noikov admired Montaigne who had managed to deliver 'a block on dogmatic pedagogy' and advocated insistently in favour of the new theory of active education, whose meaning lay in conscious learning, based on reason rather than authority.

Giving full credit to the work of philosophers like Erasmus, Luther, Melanchton and Vives, and to classical educationists like Frobel, Herbart and Spencer, Noikov dwelt exclusively on those ideas in their theories which had a bearing on modern times and could be used as a source of inspiration and wisdom.[22]

Noikov devoted particular attention to the educational heritage of Comenius. He was well aware of the contradictions in the views of this great educationist, provoked by the vestiges of medieval thought, on the one hand, and the powerful Renaissance ideas, on the other. That contradiction he formulated in the following way: 'With one foot still in the religious battles of his time, he made a firm step forward with the other in the direction of pedagogical naturalism.'[23]

The term 'pedagogical naturalism' is not very clear, but it is undoubtedly rooted in the idea that, by using analogies with nature, Comenius departs from conventional medieval thinking and seeks new factual and logical proofs, thus marking the beginning of a new stage in Renaissance thought and the formation of a new outlook. Stressing the progressive aspect of outlook formation, Noikov underlined Comenius' great achievements in pedagogy, including the optimistic belief in the inherent goodness of man, the need for encouraging the active involvement of children in the instruction process in order to give full vent to their abilities and potential, and the emphasis on the importance of education as a behavioural and social factor for elevating human dignity and morals. Emphasis was naturally laid on Comenius' substantiation of the need for an active expression of the human spirit, which is the salient feature of his Renaissance ideology.

The above term, though not very precise, is used by Noikov to describe Jean-Jacques Rousseau's educational theories, to which he seemed to be permanently attracted. If naturalism is identified with the realistic, sober-minded and revolutionizing ideas of the Renaissance, then, in Noikov's opinion, it acquires social significance primarily through Rousseau's view.

Rousseau's strong reaction against the violence to which children were subjected in the anti-nature schools in feudal Europe was carefully analysed. The new schools had to be freed from despotism and embrace the ideals of freedom. Noikov fully agreed with Rousseau that 'freedom and not authority is what matters most'. Noikov admired Rousseau for praising the active human spirit, for putting emphasis on acting and doing.

The abolition of feudal privileges provided possibilities for encouraging individual activity in the widest strata of the population. In Pestalozzi's educational system Noikov saw a new expression of democratic aspirations. Cherishing deep respect and admiration for his work, Noikov followed Pestalozzi's struggle for popular democratic education, which ruled out violence and infringement on the child's natural development. Noikov placed most value on Pestalozzi's idea of inculcating in all children first 'the universal principle and on this basis cultivate habits and skills'. 'Without a universal principle the human being can only be made into a machine or a creature not much higher up the ladder than animals.'[24]

Worth particular attention is Noikov's work on Tolstoy's educational heritage.[25] He approached Tolstoy very carefully, after serious preliminary work. The detailed literary review of Tolstoy's educational works includes many publications in English, German, French and Russian. The main points of Tolstoy's educational method were analysed and his main educational postulates about freedom, personal experience and the creative urges inherent to children described objectively and accurately. Noikov analysed in detail the ideas of the great Russian writer and his democratic positions. He was particularly inspired by Tolstoy's idea that people should be free to unfold their activity in the field of popular education and that the activity of children should be encouraged so that they might seek knowledge themselves, thus realizing its importance and necessity.

In all his research Noikov followed strictly the methodological requirement of analysing educationists' ideas in the light of the social and political conditions that influenced them. His approach aroused the objections of a then famous educator, Dr Zalwurk, Chief School Inspector in Karlsruhe, Germany. Zalwurk was against the interpretation of educational developments and ideas against the background of the economic, political and cultural conditions of the time. 'Nothing stable can be built upon such a foundation,' he concluded. Worried by this unjust and very severe criticism by a famous German educationist, Noikov subjected all his work to serious re-appraisal. Finally, he found insufficient grounds to change his views. 'I have to admit', he wrote, 'that I could find no motives to make me abandon my position. On the contrary, the more I read the works of famous educationists . . ., the stronger my conviction of the necessity of introducing these categories in pedagogy became.'[26] This position speaks volumes, not only of Noikov's self-confidence but also of the strength of his character, reflected in the firm defence of his views.

Interest in the history of education in Bulgaria

One of Noikov's greatest scientific merits is his profound research of the history of Bulgarian education. The results of his work were summarized in a two-part monograph published posthumously.[27]

Noikov's monograph was preceded by publications by other authors which, however, were of a more general, informative nature or referred to concrete events. The founder of the first new 'mutual approach' school in Bulgaria, Vassil Aprilov, published a book in 1841 intended to inform Russian readers of the historical development and current state of Bulgarian education.[28] Petko Slaveikov's book on the same school at Gabrovo contains more detailed historical information.[29] On the initiative of Ivan Shishmanov, then Chief Secretary at the Ministry of Public Education, a detailed plan for collecting material on teaching history in Bulgaria was developed in 1890. The first to summarize this material was Nikola Vankov, but his work simply conformed to the requirements of a school textbook.[30]

Noikov's monograph is a serious scientific study based on considerable factual material. He worked on it for over two decades, probing into one aspect of the problem or another. He harboured a genuine admiration for the role of education in the history of Bulgaria. Despite the extremely difficult social and political conditions Bulgarians lived under during the period of Turkish domination, they took exceptional care to keep and develop their schools. This fact filled Noikov with justifiable pride. The Bulgarians' confidence in the power of education strengthened their spirit and preserved them as a nation.

In the very first pages of the book Noikov strove to formulate the factors which had determined the relatively high level of Bulgarian education throughout the ages.

> Bulgarian education did not have the pillars that education in other countries is based on: no nation-state or national local administration, national church, favourable political and economic conditions, civil, church and school freedom. On the contrary, there were only persecutions of which European history seems to know nothing. These were the conditions in which Bulgarian education developed.[31]

Noikov thought it extremely important to explain 'how the Bulgarians had managed to bring their education system up to a level with other nations, when there were so few prerequisites for it. That is the most interesting thing about Bulgarian education, the only aspect of significance to pedagogy.'[32]

The theoretical and practical assets of his study lay, in his opinion, in first revealing the Bulgarian people's attitude to education and second, providing historically grounded confirmation of the power of education as a social factor in a nation's life.

Relying on facts alone, Noikov studied in detail the socio-political conditions, ideological movements and the state of Bulgarian education through the centuries, presenting in an objective way both the official line and the ideas and practices of the suppressed classes, and of the Bogomil social movement in particular, whose anti-feudal struggle was waged under the banner of religious reformism. Noikov justly emphasized the role of monasteries in the process. In the prevailing historical conditions they ceased to function as closed establishments, where prayers for the salvation of one's soul were read, and became open educational establishments for children who would 'then return to the people' to teach and instruct them. The monasteries were essentially centres of teaching and patriotic education. For about 400 years they were beacons of education and literacy for the enslaved Bulgarian people.

The content and methods of teaching were carefully analysed. Even under the hardships of primitive teaching and in overcoming difficulties Noikov saw a manifestation of the Bulgarians' thirst for knowledge.

Noikov analysed in detail the progress of Bulgarian education during the national revival period, putting emphasis on the two main trends: the educative and the revolutionary. He described the process of national awakening and growing self-confidence with its underlying desire for cultural, intellectual and political independence. The people strove to improve their intellectual status in order to claim their irrevocable right to be free. Geared to meet the requirements and needs of life, the school served progress and the revolutionary struggle for liberation.

Noikov's book contains some general ideas too, including real historical facts used to reveal education's role as a spiritual unifying factor, and emphasis on education's importance for preserving and enriching the cultural values needed to guarantee the all-round development of culture and the consolidation of the people's moral and political consciousness.

The pros and cons of being the first

Noikov began his work as a lecturer and researcher at a time when there were no firmly established teaching traditions in Bulgaria, neither in schools nor at the university. So, in the circumstances he had to resort to the old academic rule: in order to guarantee the success of lecturing work, it should be based on previous or parallel research work. And since there were no such traditions, Noikov had to create them.

One of the advantages of being the first is that one can advance new ideas and pave new ways for research, making a contribution in every area. But there is the problem of no previous experience, of taking inevitable risks, of the impossibility of making comparisons with other research results in the same area. There is also the danger of self-complacency, of considering one's own theories and views as unshakable, not requiring revision or change. Fortunately Noikov was demanding and critical of his own work. His research in the main branches of education was serious and profound. On matters of key importance he organized special seminars with his students and then analysed and summarized the works of Comenius, Rousseau and Herbart, as well as matters relating to child psychology and the anthropometric and psychological characteristics of Bulgarian children. Seminars were also organized on teaching methods in the physical and mathematical sciences and the humanities.

There were mistakes, too, but they were unavoidable where there was insufficient experience from the past and personal experience was rather limited. The true value of a scholar and lecturer lies not in avoiding mistakes but in overcoming them, in keeping up the standards of scientific exactitude and proceeding onwards, setting new and more complicated tasks for oneself. Noikov was such a man. He was not one of those academics who could afford to read the same course of lectures over and over again. He could not limit his speciality to only one field. His versatile interests prompted him to engage in various activities and created favourable prerequisites for him to cover all basic branches of pedagogy in his research.

It is difficult but also ennobling to be the first. Most important, however, is to be worthy of one's duty and mission in life. Noikov proved himself worthy of his noble mission, leaving an outstanding example for future generations.

Notes

1. This text was originally published in *Prospects,* Vol. 20, No. 3, 1990.
2. Profiles of Comenius, Pestalozzi, Rousseau and Tolstoy appear in this series of '100 Thinkers on Education'—Ed.
3. P. Noikov, 'Universal and National Education', *Bulgarian Review*, Vol. 6, No. 6, 1900.
4. Ibid., p. 26.
5. Ibid., p. 23.
6. Ibid., p. 33.

7. Ibid., p. 40.
8. 'The Public Schools in Britain', *School Review,* 1903; 'Trade Education in Britain', *National Economy,* 1909; 'Personal Observations in French Schools', *School Review*, 1902, and others.
9. Noikov, op. cit., p. 34.
10. Ibid., p. 34.
11. P. Noikov, 'Active Education', *Yearbook of Sofia University*, 1904.
12. P. Noikov, *The Theory of Active Education,* Kyustendil, 1906.
13. Noikov, 'Active Education', op. cit., p. 2.
14. Noikov, *The Theory of Active Education,* op. cit., p. 4.
15. P. Noikov, 'The Berlin State Seminar in Pedagogy for Secondary School Teachers', *School Review,* 1898, p. 1284.
16. It has unfortunately not been published. The manuscript is in the Central State History Archives (f. 1106, a.u.1.)
17. P. Noikov and D. Katsarov. *Physiological Manifestations of the Sexual Maturation of Bulgarian School Students,* Sofia, 1919.
18. Ibid.
19. P. Noikov, 'Rousseau's Theories of Civil Education', *Dvadeseti vek* [Twentieth Century], 1901, p. 29.
20. Ibid., p. 74.
21. Ibid.
22. Profiles of Erasmus, Frobel, Herbart, Spencer and Vives appear in this series of '100 Thinkers on Education'—Ed.
23. Noikov, 'Rousseau's Theories . . .', op. cit., p. 24.
24. Noikov, *The Theory of Active Education*, op. cit., p. 150.
25. P. Noikov, 'L. Tolstoy's Pedagogy', *Yearbook of Sofia University,* 1908/09.
26. Noikov, *The Theory of Active Education,* op. cit., p. 8.
27. P. Noikov, 'A Glimpse at the Development of Teaching in Bulgaria until the Time of Paissy', *Yearbook of Sofia University.* 1925 (Department of History and Philology, Book 21); 'A Glimpse at the Development of Teaching in Bulgaria from the Time of Paissy to the End of the Nineteenth Century', *Yearbook of Sofia University.* (Book 22.)
28. V. E. Aprilov, *Denneetsa Novobolgarskovo Obrazovanya* [The Dawn of New Bulgarian Education], Odessa, 1841. (In Russian.)
29. P. R. Slaveikov, *The Gabrovo School and its First Trustees.* 1866.
30. N. I. Vankov. *History of Education in Bulgaria.* 1903.
31. Noikov, 'A Glimpse at the Development of Teaching in Bulgaria . . .', op. cit., pp. 1, 3.
32. Ibid., p. 3.

Works by Peter Noikov

General Humane Education and Education of the People. *Balgarski pregled* (Sofia), No. 7, 1900. (In Bulgarian.)

Passive Methods of Education from the Point of View of School Hygiene. *Outchilichten pregled*, No. 10, 1905. (In Bulgarian.)

Jean-Jacques Rousseau's Study on Civic Education. *Yearbook of Sofia University,* 1906. (In Bulgarian.)

Active Education. *Yearbook of Sofia University,* 1905. (In Bulgarian.)

The Pedagogy of Lev Tolstoy. *Yearbook of Sofia University*, 1908-09. (In Bulgarian.)
Physiological Effects of the Sexual Maturity of Bulgarian Pupils (Boys and Girls). Sofia, 1919. (In Bulgarian.)
A Glimpse at the Development of Teaching in Bulgaria. *Yearbook of Sofia University*, 1925-26. 2 vols. (In Bulgarian.)

Works about Peter Noikov

Atanassov, G. *Peter Noikov*. Sofia, University of Sofia 'Kliment Ohridsky', 1987. (In Bulgarian.)
Doutiline, S. The Education System of L. N. Tolstoy Analysed by a Bulgarian Professor. *Svobodnoe vospitanie*, No. 6, 1910/11. (In Russian.)
Katsarov, D. Peter Noikov. *Yearbook of the University of Sofia*. Sofia, University of Sofia 'Kliment Ohridsky', 1927. (In Bulgarian.)
A complete bibliography can be found in:
Rochmanova, M. *Avec l'élan de l'enthousiasme d'un savant illuminé: Peter Noikov* [With the Enthusiastic Impetus of a Gifted Scholar: Peter Noikov]. Sofia, Editions 'Otetchestven Front', 1987.

JULIUS KAMBARAGE NYERERE

(1922–)

Yussuf Kassam

Julius Nyerere, the former and founding President of the United Republic of Tanzania, is known not only as one of the world's most respected statesmen and an articulate spokesman of African liberation and African dignity but also as an educator and an original and creative educational thinker. Before launching his political career he was a teacher and, as a result of his writings on educational philosophy and the intimate interaction between his political leadership and educational leadership for the country, he is fondly and respectfully referred to by the title of 'Mwalimu' [teacher] by Tanzanians and others. This is Gillette's (1977) view of him:

> Indeed, part of Nyerere's charisma lies in the fact that, before launching his political career with the founding of the Tanganyika African National Union (TANU) in 1954, he was a teacher and that his concept of his role as national leader includes constant reassessment, learning and explanation, i.e. education in the broadest sense. Since Independence, and particularly since the threshold year of 1967, Tanzania has been something of a giant in-service seminar, with Nyerere in the professor's chair.

Many features of his educational philosophy have a universal relevance and have inspired many educators and educational and development organizations around the world. In particular, his educational philosophy has often been regarded as an appropriate and rational educational alterative for many Third World countries. This has to be understood in the light of the realities of underdevelopment, perpetuated by colonialism and nascent capitalism in many Third World countries, including the United Republic of Tanzania. More specifically, it has to be understood in relation to changing the inherited Western model of education in a poor and developing country aspiring to a self-reliant and socialist development, for, in the final analysis, it is the goals of egalitarianism and human-centred development that characterize Nyerere's political ideology.

Nyerere's philosophy of adult education and adult learning is considered very progressive among the international adult education community and non-

governmental organizations engaged in development work. His philosophy of adult education resonates with the concepts of 'conscientization', empowerment and liberation very akin to the ideas expressed in Paulo Freire's *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, while his ideas on adult learning are very similar to the theories and principles of adult learning of such renowned adult educators as Malcolm Knowles of the United States and J. Roby Kidd of Canada. It was because of his vision of, and commitment to, adult education that he was approached to become the Founding Honorary President of the International Council for Adult Education in 1973.

The bulk of this profile is devoted to an examination of Nyerere's educational philosophy; it is followed by a short section on the major changes and reforms that have taken place in the Tanzanian education system.

Brief background on Nyerere's career

A very brief account of Nyerere's educational and political careers needs to be given in order to fully understand the origins and context of his educational philosophy. Julius Nyerere was born at Butiama, in the north of the United Republic of Tanzania, in April 1922. He was the son of a Zanaki chief. Educated at Roman Catholic mission schools, he was baptized a Catholic at the age of 20. After teacher training at Makerere College, Uganda, he taught until 1949, when he went to the University of Edinburgh on a government scholarship, the first Tanganyikan to attend a British university. He received a Master's degree in history and political economy in 1952 and returned to teach in Tanganyika. During the course of his studies at Edinburgh, he translated Shakespeare's *Julius Caesar* into Kiswahili. In 1954, Nyerere was a founder-member of the Tanganyika African National Union (TANU), of which he was elected president. He was briefly a nominated member of the Tanganyikan Legislative Council in 1954 and 1957. Abandoning teaching for full-time politics, he pressed the case for Tanganyikan independence at the United Nations in 1955 and 1956. He was elected to the Legislative Council in 1958 and reelected in 1960, when TANU won seventy of the seventy-one seats. Nyerere became Chief Minister of Tanganyika's first cabinet and was designated Prime Minister on the achievement of full independence in December 1961. In January 1962 he resigned the premiership to devote himself to party affairs. The following December, when Tanganyika became a republic, he was elected President. He became President of the United Republic of Tanzania after the union of Tanganyika and Zanzibar in 1964 and was reelected to successive five-year terms beginning in 1965. After retiring from the presidency in 1985, he remained Chairman of the Chama Cha Mapinduzi (CCM), or Revolutionary Party, formed in 1977 by the merger of TANU and the Afro-Shirazi Party of Zanzibar. He retired from CCM's chairmanship in 1990.

Tanzania's development ideology

To understand Nyerere's philosophy of education, it is necessary to give a brief outline of the particular nature of development ideology that Nyerere espoused.

During the formulation of Nyerere's educational philosophy, the United Republic of Tanzania's development goals and strategies were based on the policy of socialism and self-reliance enshrined in the Arusha Declaration of 1967 (Nyerere, 1968*a*). Socialism laid stress on the concept of equal opportunity and the need to reduce social inequities. As Nyerere (1968*e*, p. 340) stated:

> The objective of socialism in the United Republic of Tanzania is to build a society in which all members have equal rights and equal opportunities; in which all can live in peace with their neighbours without suffering or imposing injustice, being exploited, or exploiting; and in which all have a gradually increasing basic level of material welfare before any individual lives in luxury.

In the context of the United Republic of Tanzania's realities of poverty and underdevelopment, the Arusha Declaration emphasized the need for mobilizing human resources for self-reliant development rather than relying on capital or material resources: 'The development of a country is brought about by people, not by money. Money, and the wealth it represents, is the result and not the basis of development' (Nyerere, 1968*a*, p. 243). The three prerequisites of development identified were land, good policies and good leadership.

The focus of development was realistically trained on the rural areas, since about 90 per cent of the people live there and the majority of them depend on subsistence agriculture. Rural development was further based on encouraging people to live and work together on a co-operative basis through the formation of organized villages or *ujamaa* (a Kiswahili word meaning 'familyhood', the concept on which Tanzanian socialism is based).

In addition to raising the standard of living, Tanzanian socialism also aimed to develop a particular quality of life that is people-centred. It attached commitment to the belief that there are more important things in life than the amassing of riches, and that if the pursuit of wealth clashes with concepts like human dignity and social equality, the latter will be given priority 'for the purpose of all social, economic and political activity must be man' (Nyerere, 1968*d*, p. 316).

It is only through the development of people rather than things that people's true freedom and human dignity can be preserved. The development of roads, buildings and agricultural production, and so forth are regarded only as tools of development. 'A new road extends a man's freedom only if he travels upon it' (Nyerere, 1973*c*, p. 59).

The commitment to socialist and self-reliant development required participation of the people in the planning and decision-making processes pertaining to their own development. (See, for example, TANU, 1971, p. 9.)

In *The Varied Paths to Socialism*, Nyerere noted the danger of a situation that lacks the participation of the people:

> If the people are not involved in public ownership, and cannot control the policies followed, the public ownership can lead to fascism not socialism . . . socialism is only possible if the people as a whole are involved in the government of their political and economic affairs [Nyerere, 1968*c*, pp. 309-10].

In a nutshell, development in the United Republic of Tanzania was conceived in terms of a more equitable distribution of wealth and the absence of exploitation rather than in terms of the gross national product alone. Development is not confined exclusively to increasing economic production and productivity, but includes all-round development of the people in terms of their education, health, nutrition, housing, child care and the like, and, above all, the achievement of a particular quality of life that is people-centred. Development plans and policies should be focused on the majority of the people, and that means rural development. Development also stressed the importance of people's active participation in, and control of, their own development.

Nyerere's educational philosophy can be analysed and classified under two main headings: (a) education for self-reliance; and (b) adult education (including lifelong learning and education for liberation).

Education for self-reliance

The bulk of Nyerere's educational philosophy is contained in his 1967 policy document entitled *Education for Self-reliance* which deals with formal schooling (Nyerere, 1968*b*). This policy has some parallels with Mahatma Gandhi's 'basic education' proposal, particularly in relation to the introduction of productive work and self-reliance in schools, as well as a 'radical restructuring of the sociology of school knowledge' (Kumar, 1989). Basically, *Education for Self-reliance:*

1. Makes a critique of the inadequacies and inappropriateness of colonial education.
2. Outlines the kind of society the United Republic of Tanzania is trying to build.
3. Examines some salient features of the education system that existed around 1967 in the light of the newly declared goals and strategy of socialist development.
4. Proposes changes designed to transform the education system in order to make it more relevant and appropriate in serving the needs and goals of a socialist society with a predominantly rural economy.

According to Nyerere, colonial education was based on the assumptions of a colonialist and capitalist society, and was therefore designed to transmit the values of the colonizing power and to train individuals for the service of the colonial state. It induced attitudes of subservience, human inequality, and individualism, and emphasized white-collar skills. The content of colonial education was largely alien and the entire education system was organized by racial segregation.

Nyerere analysed four basic features of the Tanzanian education system existing in 1967. He was particularly concerned about how it discouraged the

integration of pupils into society as a whole and promoted attitudes of inequality, intellectual arrogance and individualism among those who entered the school system.

1. Formal education is basically elitist in nature, catering to the needs and interests of the very small proportion of those who manage to enter the hierarchical pyramid of formal schooling: 'We have not until now questioned the basic system of education which we took over at the time of Independence. We have never done that because we have never thought about education except in terms of obtaining teachers, engineers, administrators, etc. Individually and collectively we have in practice thought of education as a training for the skills required to earn high salaries in the modern sector of our economy' (Nyerere, 1968*b*, p. 267).
2. The education system divorces its participants from the society for which they are supposed to be trained.
3. The system breeds the notion that education is synonymous with formal schooling, and people are judged and employed on the basis of their ability to pass examinations and acquire paper qualifications.
4. The system does not involve its students in productive work. Such a situation deprives society of their much-needed contribution to the increase in national economic output and also breeds among the students a contempt for manual work.

Given the realities of a poor, underdeveloped, and agricultural economy and the cherished goals of socialist transformation, Nyerere proposed an alternative educational model designed to reorient the goals, values and structure of education.

According to Nyerere, education must serve the common good and foster the social goals of living together and working together. Education must help in the development of a society in which all members share its resources fairly equally. Education must inculcate a sense of commitment to society. In addition to the inculcation of social values, education

> must also prepare young people for the work they will be called upon to do in the society which exists in Tanzania – a rural society where improvement will depend largely upon the efforts of the people in agriculture and in village development. This does not mean that education in Tanzania should be designed just to produce passive agricultural workers of different levels of skill who simply carry out plans or directions received from above. It must produce good farmers; it has also to prepare people for their responsibilities as free workers and citizens in a free and democratic society, albeit a largely rural society. They have to be able to think for themselves, to make judgements on all issues affecting them; they have to be able to interpret the decisions made through the democratic institutions of our society, and to implement them in the light of the local circumstances peculiar to where they happen to live.
>
> It would thus be gross misinterpretation of our needs to suggest that the educational system should be designed to produce robots, who work hard but never question what the leaders in government or TANU are doing and saying. . . . The education provided must therefore encourage the development in each citizen of three things: an enquiring mind; an

ability to learn from what others do, rejecting or adapting it to his own needs; and a basic confidence in his own position as a free and equal member of the society, who values others and is valued by them for what he does and not for what he obtains [Nyerere, 1968*b*, p. 274].

In terms of the organizational changes in the education system, Nyerere proposed three principal and interconnected changes: (a) the entry age into primary school; (b) the content of the curriculum itself; and (c) the organization of the schools. The primary-school entry age would be raised from 5 or 6 to 7 years so that the student is older, more responsible and more mature on leaving school. Primary education would be restructured in such a way that it becomes a complete education in itself, rather than simply a preparation for secondary education. Similarly, secondary education would not simply be a preparation for higher education. The major purpose of the education system should be to prepare people for a meaningful and productive life, and for service in the villages and rural areas:

We should not determine the type of things children are taught in primary schools by the things a doctor, engineer, teacher, economist, or administrator needs to know. Most of our pupils will never be any of these things. We should determine the type of things taught in the primary schools by the things which the boy or girl ought to know – that is, the skills he ought to acquire and the values he ought to cherish if he, or she, is to live happily and well in a socialist and predominantly rural society, and contribute to the improvement of life there. Our sights must be on the majority – it is they we must be aiming at in determining the curriculum and syllabus. Those most suitable for further education will still become obvious and they will not suffer. For the purpose is not to provide an inferior education to that given at present. The purpose is to provide a different education – one realistically designed to fulfil the common purpose of education in the particular society of Tanzania. The same must be true at post-primary schools [Nyerere, 1968*b*, p. 282].

The reorientation of the school curriculum has to go hand-in-hand with de-emphasizing the importance of formal examinations, which merely assess a person's ability to learn facts. Furthermore, it is necessary to abandon examinations that are geared to an 'international standard' or practice regardless of the country's particular problems and needs.

Another change Nyerere proposed in the organizational structure of schools is that they must become both social and economic centres for the local communities, so as to make them an integral part of the society and economy:

Each school should have, as an integral part of it, a farm or workshop which provides the food eaten by the community, and makes some contribution to the national income. . . . This is not a suggestion that a school farm or workshop should be attached to every school for training purposes. It is a suggestion that every school should also be a farm [Nyerere, 1968*b*, p. 283].

Such a reorganization of schools involved both pedagogical and attitudinal implications. It would contribute to the integration of theory with practice, as well as the integration of mental with manual labour. The assessment of student performance would take into account both academic abilities and the work done for the school and community. In terms of societal attitudes and values, students would learn the meaning of living together and working together for the good of all. In this way, their commitment to the development of their own society would be strengthened.

In summary, *Education for Self-reliance* proposed the following changes in the education system:

1. It should be oriented to rural life.
2. Teachers and students should engage together in productive activities and students should participate in the planning and decision-making process of organizing these activities.
3. Productive work should become an integral part of the school curriculum and provide meaningful learning experience through the integration of theory and practice.
4. The importance of examinations should be downgraded.
5. Children should begin school at age 7 so that they would be old enough and sufficiently mature to engage in self-reliant and productive work when they leave school.
6. Primary education should be complete in itself rather than merely serving as a means to higher education.
7. Students should become self-confident and co-operative, and develop critical and inquiring minds.

Adult education, lifelong learning and education for liberation

Nyerere's philosophy on adult education, lifelong learning and education for liberation is in many ways a natural development of his ideas embodied in *Education for Self-Reliance,* particularly those relating to some of the inherent limitations and inadequacies of formal schooling. While in *Education for Self-Reliance* Nyerere addressed himself primarily to the needs and conditions of the United Republic of Tanzania, his writings on adult education, lifelong learning and education for liberation deal with educational issues on a more general and universal level, as well as with those pertaining specifically to the United Republic of Tanzania. His concepts of lifelong learning and education for liberation can be subsumed under his philosophy of adult education, which, for purposes of analysis, can be placed under four main headings, albeit with some overlap.

THE ROLE OF ADULT EDUCATION IN DEVELOPMENT

Nyerere's conviction about the role of adult education as a means of development and as a part of development has been recognized by many development planners, economists and educators. In addition to imparting knowledge and skills, he looks on adult education as basically a political process.

The starting point of Nyerere's conceptualization of the role of adult education in social change and development is linked to the purpose of education in general as well as to the purpose of development as a whole. Accordingly, starting from the premise that the purpose of development is liberation, the purpose of education

> is the liberation of Man from the restraints and limitations of ignorance and dependency. Education has to increase men's physical and mental freedom — to increase their control over themselves, their own lives, and the environment in which they live. The ideas imparted by education, or released in the mind through education, should therefore be liberating ideas; the skills acquired by education should be liberating skills [Nyerere, 1978, pp. 27-28].

Similarly, Nyerere argued that adult education has to be directed at helping people to develop themselves:

> It has to contribute to an enlargement of Man's ability in every way. In particular it has to help men decide for themselves – in co-operation – what development is. It must help men to think clearly; it must enable them to examine the possible alterative courses of action; to make a choice between those alternatives in keeping with their own purposes; and it must equip them with the ability to translate their decisions into reality [Nyerere, 1978, p. 28].

In the process of doing things and acting on reality, the individual has no choice but to co-operate with others, and therefore education for liberation is also education in co-operating with others. However, learning will not have the desired liberating impact on the people if their learning is oriented to obtaining a certificate,

> for such a desire is merely another aspect of the disease of the acquisitive society – the accumulation of goods for the sake of accumulating them. The accumulation of knowledge or, worse still, the accumulation of pieces of paper which represent a kind of legal tender for such knowledge, has nothing to do with development [Nyerere, 1978, p. 29].

According to Nyerere, one of the primary and most significant functions of adult education is to arouse consciousness and critical awareness among the people about the need for and possibility of change:

> The first function of adult education is to inspire both a desire for change, and an understanding that change is possible. For a belief that poverty or suffering is 'the will of God' and that man's only task is to endure, is the most fundamental of all the enemies of freedom [Nyerere, 1978, p. 29].

The second function or stage of adult education is to help people to determine the nature of the change they want and how to bring it about. These two functions of adult education are quite similar to what Paulo Freire refers to as a process of 'conscientization', in which he argues there is a need to change the adult's pessimistic and fatalistic perspective of reality and enable that person to acquire a 'critical' vision of his or her environment (Freire, 1970).

In the context of the United Republic of Tanzania, Nyerere outlines three main objectives of adult education. The first objective is to shake Tanzanians out of a resignation to the kind of life they have lived for centuries past; the second is to help people learn how to improve their lives; the third is to help people understand the national policies of socialism and self-reliance [Nyerere, 1973*a*, pp. 137-38].

THE DEFINITION AND SCOPE OF ADULT EDUCATION

Nyerere's definition of adult education is very broad. Again it emphasizes the need for social change:

> Adult education . . . incorporates anything which enlarges men's understanding, activates them, helps them to make their own decisions, and to implement those decisions for themselves. It includes training, but it is much more than training. It includes what is generally called 'agitation' but it is much more than that. It includes organization and mobilization, but it goes beyond them to make them purposeful [Nyerere, 1978, p. 30].

The broad scope and role of adult education requires two types of adult educators, according to Nyerere. The first group consists of what he calls 'generalists' – political activists, educators, community development workers and religious teachers. Such people, he argues, cannot be politically neutral by the very nature of their work, for their important role is to activate the people and arouse their consciousness: 'Adult education is a . . . highly political activity. Politicians are sometimes more aware of this fact than educators and therefore they do not always welcome real adult education' (Nyerere, 1978, p. 31).

The second group of educators needed for adult education are what he calls 'specialists' with a wide range of professional expertise in health, nutrition, child care, agriculture, management, literacy and so on.

Nyerere's definition of adult education also incorporates the concept of lifelong learning and learning that is associated with work, normally referred to as workers' education. Two quotations serve to illustrate his viewpoint: 'Education is something that all of us should continue to acquire from the time we are born until the time we die' (Nyerere, 1973*a*). 'To live is to learn; and to learn is to try to live better' (Nyerere, 1973*a*, p. 138).

On the question of making learning an integrated part of working life, Nyerere argued:

> If we are to make real progress in adult education, it is essential that we should stop trying to divide up life into sections, one of which is for education and another, longer one of

which is for work – with occasional time off for 'courses'. In a country dedicated to change we must accept that education and working are both parts of living and should continue from birth until we die [Nyerere, 1973*b*, pp. 300-01].

THE METHODS OF ADULT EDUCATION

Nyerere defines an educator's approach to adult education on the basis that adult learning is voluntary; adult learners have to participate in identifying their own learning needs and interests, and their learning needs should be centred on their own problems and experience:

> The teacher of adults is a leader, a guide along a path which all will travel together. The teacher of adults is not giving to another something which he possesses. He is helping the learner to develop his own potential and his own capacity [Nyerere, 1978, pp. 33-34].

THE ORGANIZATION OF ADULT EDUCATION

On the question of developing an organizational structure for the provision of adult education, Nyerere recognizes that there is no ideal pattern. Therefore, the type of organization has to take into account the needs and resources of a given country as well as its cultural traditions and political commitment. One necessary condition he underlines is the need to allocate resources for adult education as part of the national budget. Adult education has to be given a priority within the overall development plans of a country, and the extent of that priority will have to be determined by a political decision. However, he warns, it would be a mistake to try to duplicate for adults the kind of establishment that exists for children in terms of staff or buildings. He does not underestimate the complex and enormous task of organizing effective adult education on a mass scale: 'There is a saying that nothing which is easy is worth doing, and it could never be said that adult education is not worth doing' (Nyerere, 1978, p. 36).

Philosophy versus practice

A detailed examination of Tanzanian education reforms[1] in terms of the application of Nyerere's educational philosophy to actual practice is beyond the scope of this profile. However, it is necessary to make some broad and general observations.

First of all, it should be pointed out that the United Republic of Tanzania's attempts to build a socialist and self-reliant society through political, economic, social and educational actions have largely failed. Since 1986 in particular, the country has been steadily veering towards the right. Tanzania is now much more integrated into the capitalist world system than it was at the time of independence.

Within the overall failure of achieving socialism, the United Republic of Tanzania's educational experiment, inspired and driven by Nyerere's educational philosophy, has produced a mixture of successes and failures. As noted by Samoff (1990, p. 210) in his detailed case-study on education in the United Republic of Tanzania, a major explanation for this combination of some success and some failure

> lies in the complex intersection of external and internal dynamics, and especially in Tanzania's unique mix of socialist vision and peripheral capitalist practice. . . . The Tanzanian experience suggests both the potential and the limits for nonrevolutionary non-capitalist development and its accompanying educational reform.

Many of the problems that Nyerere addressed in an attempt to transform the education system and educational policies still persist. Even during the peak of socialist construction, Nyerere himself made the following admission: 'I am becoming increasingly convinced that we in Tanzania either have not yet found the right educational policy, or have not yet succeeded in implementing it or some combination of these two alternatives' (Nyerere, 1974).

The policy of *Education for Self-reliance* has not been fully implemented in the totality of its philosophic concepts as well as in its practice. A number of contradictions have arisen in the process of translating theory into practice.[2]

Commenting on the United Republic of Tanzania's inconsistent educational strategy, Samoff (1990, p. 268) notes:

> Tanzania's transition is stymied. Its socialist vision is regularly obscured and often overwhelmed by its capitalist practice, both within and outside education. Frequently denounced, the modernization orientation is equally frequently reasserted, with both local and foreign support. . . . The Tanzanian experience points to the powerful obstacles, and perhaps the limits, of a nonrevolutionary transition.

However, some major achievements in the United Republic of Tanzania's educational endeavour cannot be denied. To quote Samoff again:

> Tanzania seems to offer a success story of educational reform. In a brief period, a very poor country has introduced institutional changes that reach nearly all its citizens. Primary education is essentially universal. Initial instruction uses a language and draws on experiences and materials that are familiar to everyone. Tanzania and Africa feature prominently in the curriculum at all levels. A national board sets and marks examinations. Tanzania's adult literacy is now among the highest in Africa [about 85 per cent]. Although affluence clearly enhances the likelihood of academic success, poverty does not preclude it.
>
> These accomplishments in turn provide the foundations for other programs. Nutritional and prenatal information can be disseminated much more widely. Agricultural improvement programs can reach remote farmers. Members of cooperatives and unions can monitor their leaders more effectively. Tanzanian citizens evince a pride in their language and their country that derives neither from chauvinistic propaganda nor from xenophobia, but rather —notwithstanding their relative poverty — from a sense of accomplishment and self-confidence. In the two decades since the end of European rule, these are major achievements [Samoff, 1990, p. 209].

As for adult education, there is no doubt that it has achieved a remarkable degree of success. In fact, the innovative and phenomenal developments witnessed in adult education justifiably constitute a 'revolution'.[3] The United Republic of Tanzania is recognized in many parts of the world, especially among Third World countries, as having made substantial and exciting strides in adult education. Adult education has served as one of the greatest means of mobilizing the people for development. In terms of education for liberation and conscientization, the masses of the people have, by and large, discarded their fatalistic outlook on life and emerged with more self-confidence and hope in the possibilities for improving their living conditions.

Notes

1. For a more detailed survey of educational changes in the United Republic of Tanzania, see Hinzen and Hundsdorfer (1979).
2. For a critique of *Education for Self-reliance*, see Cliffe (1973) and Mbilinyi and Mwobahe (1975).
3. For a full account of the adult education revolution in Tanzania, see Kassam (1978), and for the impact of literacy, see Kassam (1979).

References

Cliffe, L. 1973. Socialist Education in Tanzania. In: L. Cliffe and J. Saul (eds.). *Socialism in Tanzania.* Dar es Salaam, East African Publishing House.

Freire, P. 1970. *Pedagogy of the Oppressed.* New York, Herder & Herder.

Gillette, A. 1977. *Beyond the Non-formal Fashion: Towards Educational Revolution in Tanzania.* Amherst, Center for International Education, University of Massachusetts.

Hinzen, H.; Hundsdorfer, V. (eds.). 1979. *Education for Liberation and Development – The Tanzanian Experience.* Hamburg, UNESCO Institute for Education.

Kassam, Y. 1978. *The Adult Education Revolution in Tanzania.* Nairobi, Shungwaya Publishers Ltd.

——. 1979. *Illiterate No More: The Voices of New Literates from Tanzania.* Dar es Salaam, Tanzania Publishing House.

Kumar, K. 1989. Profiles of Educators: Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi. In: *Prospects* (Paris, UNESCO), Vol. 19, No. 2. (Also appears in this series of '100 Thinkers on Education' – Ed.)

Mbilinyi, M.; Mwobahe, B.L. 1975. *Challenge of Education for Self-Reliance.* Dar es Salaam, Institute of Education.

Nyerere, J. K. 1968*a*. The Arusha Declaration. *Freedom and Socialism.* Dar es Salaam, Oxford University Press.

——. 1968*b*. Education for Self-Reliance. *Freedom and Socialism.* Dar es Salaam, Oxford University Press.

——. 1968*c*. The Varied Paths to Socialism. *Freedom and Socialism.* Dar es Salaam, Oxford University Press.

——. 1968*d*. The Purpose is Man. *Freedom and Socialism.* Dar es Salaam, Oxford University Press.

——. 1968*e*. Socialism and Rural Development. *Freedom and Socialism.* Dar es Salaam, Oxford University Press.

——. 1973*a*. Adult Education Year. *Freedom and Socialism.* Dar es Salaam, Oxford University Press.
——. 1973*b*. Ten Years After Independence. *Freedom and Socialism.* Dar es Salaam, Oxford University Press.
——. 1973*c*. Freedom and Development. *Freedom and Socialism.* Dar es Salaam, Oxford University Press.
——. 1974. Education for Liberation. *Development Dialogue* (Uppsala, Dag Hammarskjold Foundation), No. 2.
——. 1978. Adult Education and Development. In: B. Hall and J. R. Kidd (eds.), *Adult Learning: A Design for Action.* London, Pergamon Press.
Samoff, J. 1990. 'Modernizing' a Socialist Vision: Education in Tanzania. In: M. Carnoy and J. Samoff (eds.). *Education and Social Transition in the Third World.* Princeton, N.J., Princeton University Press.
TANU (Tanganyika African National Union). 1971. *TANU Guidelines.* Dar es Salaam, Government Printer.

Works on education by Julius K. Nyerere

1968. Education for Self-Reliance. *Freedom and Socialism.* Dar es Salaam, Oxford University Press.
1973. Adult Education Year. *Freedom and Development.* Dar es Salaam, Oxford University Press.
1973. Relevance and Dar es Salaam University. *Freedom and Development.* Dar es Salaam, Oxford University Press.
1973. Ten Years After Independence. *Freedom and Development.* Dar es Salaam, Oxford University Press.
1974. Education for Liberation. *Development Dialogue* (Uppsala, Dag Hammarskjöld Foundation), No. 2.
1975. Education Never Ends. *Adult Education and Development in Tanzania.* Dar es Salaam, National Adult Education Association of Tanzania.
1978. Adult Education and Development. In: B. Hall and J. R. Kidd (eds.), *Adult Learning: A Design for Action.* London, Pergamon Press.

JOSÉ ORTEGA Y GASSET

(1883–1955)

Juan Escámez Sánchez

The problem of Spain is one of education

If there is one special characteristic which draws the attention of the reader to Ortega y Gasset it is his remarkable curiosity: no subject or event was too insignificant to avoid his interest or be given his attention, as can be seen from his voluminous writings.[1] He enjoyed a number of characteristics that distinguish him from the stereotype of the philosopher: his thinking does not seem to be structured into a system; it most frequently finds expression in newspaper articles, while his most important works were published in the form of essays; lastly, the elegance of his style sweeps the reader along, making rigorous analysis of the ideas presented rather difficult.

The question of Ortega's 'system' of philosophy, its thematic dispersion and his literary qualities have already been dealt with by specialists in the relevant areas. In this article we shall confine ourselves to those questions which lead to an understanding of the educational dimension of Ortega's work, which I feel to be important and to which little attention has been paid so far. He considered his vocation to be the cultivation of thought, which for him could only be philosophical thought.[2]

Ortega's great passion was the education of the Spanish people. As has been shown by Cerezo,[3] the driving force behind Ortega's thought was his continuous and intensive meditation on the problem of Spain, and his own intellectual evolution is indissolubly linked with this concern. This is the key to any interpretation of his political, cultural and philosophical activities; they were all geared to the socio-political reform of his country, although focused on different levels and spheres of the life of society. Ortega was, first and foremost, an educator on a national scale whose aim was the reform and transformation of Spain. To attain his goal he felt that all means could and should be used: newspapers, magazines, books, his influence as a university professor, politics, etc.

The transformation of Spain was seen by the young Ortega as its incorporation into European culture. This was, in essence, what he felt to be his public calling as an intellectual, and his destiny as an educator, almost as a social reformer: to strive to place Spain on an equal cultural footing with other European countries. The diversity of Ortega's approaches to culture and the problem of Spain will help us to follow the evolution of his thought, in both its philosophical and its educational aspects. How did Ortega develop his function as an educator? As he himself constantly repeated, 'in the light of circumstances'.

Ortega and his circumstances

In order to understand a person we need to follow his life story and its development in terms of the various situations in which it had been his lot to live. This is particularly important in Ortega's case because it was one of his central themes. In a lecture which he gave for the fourth centenary of the death of Juan Luis Vives, he describes how a serious biography should be written.[4] He tells us that it involves making an intellectual reconstruction of a 'bios', of a human life. For human beings the business of living means coping with the surrounding world, our geographical and social environment. For a serious biographer it is the social environment in which we are born and live that is most important. This social world is made up of people, but also of habits, fashions, customs and the whole system of beliefs, ideas, preferences and standards which make up what is variously referred to as the life of society, contemporary trends, or the spirit of the time. All this is inculcated into children by family, school, social relations, reading and the system of law. A large portion of this social world becomes part of the authentic 'I' which each one of us is; but there also emerge beliefs, opinions, aspirations and tastes which, to one degree or the other, are in conflict with our surroundings. This is the stuff of the combat which is life, especially that of an outstanding life.

With what type of environment did Ortega have to deal, and how did he react to it? The limitations of a work of this type force us to consider only those circumstances which help us to understand our subject as an educator,[5] eschewing – among other things – analysis of the influences on his philosophical thought, which has been dealt with in a number of excellent works.[6]

José Ortega y Gasset was born in Madrid on 9 May 1883. As the son of José Ortega Munilla and Dolores Gasset, he was connected on both sides of his family to the most representative cultural and political circles in Spain at that time. His father, who was by no means an insignificant writer himself, became a member of the Spanish Royal Academy in 1902; he was, above all, a journalist and contributed to the literary section of the newspaper *El Imparcial*, the most prestigious publication of its day, founded by our subject's maternal grandfather, Eduardo Gasset, a liberal monarchist. At an early age, José Ortega y Gasset embarked on his career as a journalist – at 19 he published his first article – belonging to a family in which public life in the realms of letters and politics

always found an immediate response. His family environment was decisive for his concern with the social and cultural problems of Spanish society, sometimes leading him into active political life and always making him regard his work as a service to Spain. I believe that his love of journalism and his preference for newspapers as a means of expressing his thought – as well as the fact that he did so with literary elegance – are the direct result of his family environment.

In 1891, at the age of 8, he was sent as a boarder to the school which the Jesuits ran in Miraflores del Palo, Málaga, and he remained there until 1897. He began his university studies – in law and philosophy – at the University of Deusto (1897-98), also run by the Jesuits, and went on to the Universidad Central de Madrid, from which he graduated with a bachelor's degree in philosophy (1902), and a doctorate (1904), with a thesis entitled *Los terrores del año mil: critica de una leyenda* [The Terrors of the Year 1000: Assessment of a Legend]. He criticized his Jesuit educators for the style and negativism of their teachings, their intolerance and, above all, their limited knowledge and intellectual incompetence.[7] Ortega's experience at university in Madrid was also disappointing, and he described the teaching there as being of the utmost mediocrity.[8] Justified or not, Ortega's overall view of the education he received is a negative one.

However, a full understanding of Ortega's educational activity requires consideration not only of his family background and schooling, but also of the special psychological state of Spanish society during those years, since he felt himself to be part of a generation, 'which came of age intellectually in the terrible year of 1898, and which since that time has not only failed to see the dawn of a single day of glory or abundance, but never known an hour of sufficiency'.[9] The year 1898 was a turning-point. With the Treaty of Paris, Spain gave up its rights of sovereignty over Cuba, which became a free nation, at the same time ceding Puerto Rico, the Philippines and Guam to the United States of America. The loss of their colonies filled the Spanish people with bitterness, anguish and pessimism. Spanish intellectual activity began to focus on what was described as the 'problem of Spain' which, in fact, covered a host of problems. These were analysed, and Spain's historical values mercilessly criticized; each author, whatever his area of activity, sought, each in his own way, an explanation for the 'problem of Spain' and the causes of the country's decline.

This critical period laid the foundations for a scientific, artistic and philosophical movement which was to earn Spain the kind of reputation it had not enjoyed since the sixteenth century.[10] It would be impossible to list the many eminent figures concerned, but we can say that modern Spain began with the 'generation of '98', which was innovative in so many ways, but above all had a new way of looking at Spanish society and intellectual topics. Ortega shared his generation's pain and bitterness at what was felt to be Spain's humiliation; he tried, with that generation, to understand the reasons for the current state of Spanish culture, education, politics and science. But while the others expressed their unhappiness with great lyricism, evoking past glories, Ortega called for hope, action and dedication to change the present painful situation of his country,

looking not to the past but to the future, and taking note of how it was perceived by the rest of Europe. This seems to be at the root of his love/hate relationship with the most typical representative of the generation of '98, Miguel de Unamuno. He also differed from the rest of his generation in that his approach was theoretical rather than literary. In what crucible, then, did Ortega forge his theoretical framework? This question leads us to the fourth and last environmental influence.

'Fleeing my country's mediocrity',[11] in his own words, Ortega decided in 1905 to study in Germany, beginning with the University of Leipzig, where he studied Kant: 'there I had my first desperate hand-to-hand struggle with the *Critique of Pure Reason*, so tremendously difficult for a Latin mind to assimilate';[12] the following year he visited Nuremberg and studied for a semester in Berlin, under Professor Simmel, who influenced his thinking to some extent. It was his stay in Marburg, however, his third stop, that was crucial. There, for the first time, he studied under two well-known teachers, Hermann Cohen and Paul Natorp, who were leading proponents of Neo-Kantianism. Marburg was to have a profound influence on Ortega, not only intellectually, on his philosophical and educational training, but also on his personality. Natorp's influence was particularly important for the subject which concerns us here – Ortega as an educator. During his stays in various European countries, Ortega was given an excellent training in philosophy and conceived an admiration for the scientific and technical development that was taking place, as well as for tenacity and discipline, especially those of the German people. His Europeanism sprang from an attitude of not uncritical interest, a willingness to incorporate what could be incorporated, without giving up Spanish identity. On his return from Marburg in 1908, he was appointed Professor of Logic, Psychology and Ethics at the Escuela Superior de Magisterio, and in 1910 he won the competition for the post of Professor of Metaphysics at the Universidad Central de Madrid.

These, then, were the main circumstances of the times which Ortega had to confront and out of which he shaped his own life, and specifically the beliefs which he had adopted by 1910, the time when he wrote his first educational work. However, Ortega's thought continued to evolve in response to changing circumstances, as he himself declared in 1932, referring back to his words in *Meditations on Quixote* (1914):

> I am I, and my circumstance. This expression, which appears in my first book and which, in the final volume, condenses my philosophical thought, does not only mean the doctrine which my work expounds and proposes, but also that my work is an effective instance of that same doctrine. My work is, in essence and presence, circumstantial.[13]

The interpretation which Ortega gives us of his own philosophy makes it impossible to treat it as a system, and much less as a closed system. The driving force behind Ortega's thinking, focused on the problem of Spain, is the constant search for solutions, including both theoretical approaches and strategies for action – as a result of which the specialists have had some trouble in identifying the various stages of its development.[14] This development can be observed in his educational

writings; furthermore, it is my belief that three of these works are the genuine representation of each of the stages of his thought – on which we will now focus our attention.

An idealistic approach to teaching

Ortega's stay in Marburg, Germany, brought him into contact with Neo-Kantianism, which was a philosophy of culture, of objective order and spheres of value – a critical-transcendental rationalism which analyses the products of modern culture, science, art, law, ethics and politics, in order to identify their underlying principles and criteria of validity.

Neo-Kantianism was also an energetic teaching philosophy capable of orientating mankind, of transforming it according to an ideal, which is none other than the Kantian ideal of a cosmopolitan humanity. The Neo-Kantian concept of man as a cultural phenomenon implies that real personal development lies in the shaping of the individual to ideals, in the adjustment of behaviour to standards, to what *should* be done. These standards have universal validity. Biological and instinctive impulses must submit to a superior force, to the ideal. Freedom does not mean spontaneity; it is not appetite, nor caprice, but thought and education, in other words, the active shaping of the individual by universal values.

This philosophy of culture and education which promotes the search for objective, universal, generic truth, seemed to the young Ortega to be a system of thought which could help in solving the problem of Spain. In Spain – in contrast with German culture – the dominant forces were spontaneity, subjectivity, particularism and sectarianism. This resulted in energy being wasted in internal confrontations, isolated gestures and in some people carefully undoing what others had equally carefully put together, in short it explained the lamentable situation in which Spain found itself. His contact with Europe, especially with German Neo-Kantianism, convinced Ortega that the key to the salvation of Spain, to its historical recovery, lay in cultural reform.

His first statements on education belong to this stage of his thinking. This lecture, given in Bilbao on 12 March 1910, was entitled *La pedagogía social como programa político* [Social Education as a Political Programme].[15]

He began by describing the serious shortcomings which had held Spain back for the past three centuries and prevented it from becoming a real nation. His Neo-Kantian position at that time made him feel that Spain was not a nation because it did not exist as a community, regulated by objective laws with a rational basis – laws which were accepted by everyone and which were the expression of collective duties. Spain was not a nation because its citizens were not dedicated to attaining the objective ideals of science, art and ethics, through which human communities achieve full development.

Spain, rather, was the country of individualism and subjectivism, of people who made it their aim to do exactly as they wished, without subjecting them-

selves to any rule other than that of their own free will. The first step towards solving the problem of Spain would be to recognize the absence of culture – meaning the collective realization of ideals – in Spanish life. To recognize this would not be a reason for despondency but rather a diagnosis which made clear the difference between what was and what ought to be. Although it would be painful to become aware of the true reality of the Spanish situation, it would make Spaniards consider what their country ought to be like and how it could be changed. Ortega's reasoning, although impassioned, was rigorous. Spain had a problem, and that problem was its lack of what was understood in the rest of Europe as culture. The task that lay ahead of it was to acquire that culture in the European way, as defined by Neo-Kantianism. As awareness of this problem developed, as the diagnosis became more detailed, it would become possible to perceive the goal that had to be attained and the means of achieving it. This goal was to transform Spain and give it access to the cultural patterns prevailing in the rest of Europe.

Ortega saw education as part of the process of attaining this cultural transformation. He pointed out that the Latin word *eductio* or *educatio* meant drawing one thing out of another, or converting one thing into something better. Although he did not go into terminological details, he provided us with a concept of education which is generally accepted now and which is rooted in *educatio*. He saw it as all the actions undertaken to bring reality closer to an ideal.

After establishing the meaning of the word education, Ortega set out to determine the functions of pedagogy as the science of education. He saw it as having two functions. The first was the objective identification of the ideal to be attained, of the purpose of education and the second, essential, function was the identification of the intellectual, moral and aesthetic means of making this ideal attractive to the student.

Given that education is the process of transforming the individual, there is an important question that needs to be answered concerning the nature of the ideal human being whose attainment is the purpose of education, and calling for the application of certain methods. This was the question to which he addressed himself in his lectures.

Firstly he stated that human beings are not merely biological organisms. The biological aspect is simply the pretext for human existence. The distinguishing feature of human beings is their ability to work towards an ideal and in so doing to create mathematics, art, ethics and law. The distinguishing feature of human beings is culture.

Ortega specifies further that the real human being does not live in isolation from the rest. In each individual he distinguishes between the empirical 'I' with its own caprices, loves, hatreds and appetites, and the 'I' which can perceive universal truth, universal goodness and universal beauty. In other words, he distinguishes an empirical 'I' from a generic 'I', the one which is capable of creating culture. Science, ethics, art, etc., are specifically human phenomena, and what makes a person truly human is participation in the scientific, moral and artistic

life of the community. The ideal human that is the goal of education is a being who can create culture together with others.

If this is the ideal to be pursued, education must address itself not to the empirical 'I', which is the root of individualism, but to the generic 'I' which feels, thinks and desires in terms of ideals. All this means that education must be the process by which biological or natural impulses are directed towards ideals, and thus begin to function in accordance with the system of standards derived from these ideals.

In this first stage, Ortega's views on the binary of nature/nurture or culture/life with regard to education were influenced by his Neo-Kantian teachers and clearly biased towards nurture. However, he already had a strong intellectual personality and a range of socio-political interests which were not easily reconciled with the formalism of his teachers in Marburg, and so his views present certain distinctive features which it would be useful to examine.

The first is the historical dimension with which he endows human beings and his understanding of what it means to be a social being. When describing the social nature of human beings, and in order to make it clear that teachers are dealing with a social fabric rather than individuals, Ortega tells us 'the whole of the past is crystallized in the present; nothing that ever existed has been lost; the veins of those who have died are only empty because their blood is now flowing through our young veins'.[16] In this literary image we can see a vision of man in which distinctive features that have developed over time can be present in specific individuals as opposed to 'generic' humanity. This concept of the gradual shaping of the individual by the concrete events during the course of life was to increase in intensity and become one of the leitmotifs of Ortega's later anthropological thought.

The second distinctive feature of Ortega's views on this subject is the importance he attaches to the production of cultural objects. I think it is true to say that an obsession with praxis permeates the whole of his work. He is especially interested in the process of cultural construction – the actual, concrete production of objects. For him, culture is labour, the production of things for human beings, activity. 'By greater or lesser culture we mean greater or lesser capacity to produce things, to work. Things, products, are the measure and trade-mark of culture'.[17]

This was the basis for his proposal that the purpose of education should be for work and by work, work which would not be individual but shared. He felt that this would make it possible to overcome the selfishness, the fratricidal struggles and lack of co-operation among Spaniards. For one author[18] his advocacy of education for work and by work makes Ortega a supporter of active education. In the perspective from which we are analysing him, keeping the problem of Spain as the basis of his thought, I think we can see Ortega's fundamental aim as the cultural transformation of his society, and pedagogy as the means to achieve this social and cultural reconstruction. And if this was considered to be

'political', he tells us that 'politics for us has become the education of society and Spain's problem an educational one'.[19]

The views which we have analysed go to make up a philosophy of education focused on the cultural achievement of the individual as a member of the social whole. Political action is reduced – in the final analysis – to cultural action, to the education of society, because human beings, as cultural entities, find their fulfilment in social life, in co-operation and communication. Ortega, in this first period, considered that the solution to the Spanish problem was cultural reform through education.

From this position, and on the basis of his intellectual commitment to the transformation of Spanish society, Ortega's thought was to evolve until he reached the conclusion that Spain's salvation could only be achieved by employing its own inner energies and possibilities, its idiosyncrasies and historical reality. The Neo-Kantian Ortega advocated man as a producer of culture, a creator of ideal forms, a human individual working towards the construction of a culture which would be valid for all mankind. Ortega gradually discovered that an individual of this kind is an abstraction, and that rationalism – which is a form of idealism – had forgotten the real and concrete man who lives in a real and concrete situation. It was necessary to look round at this person for him/her to be revealed in radical reality, and this meant overcoming the narrow-sightedness of rationalism. A new approach had to be adopted to the understanding of man, and Ortega's encounter with phenomenology was to help him on this new intellectual path. His dissatisfaction with the concept of man as a cultural being began to grow in 1911 and this estrangement can be seen clearly in his *Meditations on Quixote*, written in 1914.

A vitalistic pedagogy

When he turned his attention to the individual, to a person's concrete reality, Ortega saw that man's being is the act of living; life is the radical and indispensable reality which must be taken as the basis for action, which must be made use of. This conviction, which prevented him from considering culture as an autonomous and independent sphere, was gradually to become one of the keys of his philosophy, as he was to remind us in his later years: 'the first thing, then, which philosophy must do is to define this fact, to define what my life, our life, the path of each one of us is. Living is the radical way of being: all other things and ways of being are to be found in my life, within it, as a detail of it or reference to it'.[20] In the tug-of-war between nature and nurture, life and culture, the latter lost the dominance it had gained during Ortega's idealistic stage and came to be thought of as a manifestation of life. Culture was henceforth felt to consist of living life to the full.

If culture means living life to the full, then life – conceived as elemental life – should be considered to be the basis of culture. As he delved deeper in this direction, Ortega was led to an interpretation of life as creativity. This fundamen-

tal change, from idealism to vitalism, although obviously not unrelated to Ortega's readings in philosophy, which we shall not analyse here, was fundamentally a result of his reflection on the Spanish situation. Ortega, who had once advocated the socio-political reform of Spain, its culture to be recast in the European mode, now realized that its own inner energies would have to be tapped to save the country. As he looked at the reality of his country, he realized that Spain's distinguishing characteristic was its vigorous affirmation of immediate and elemental life.

At this stage of the development of his thought, Ortega wrote an essay entitled 'Biología y pedagogía' [Biology and Education],[21] in which he set forth his ideas on education in the context of the controversy surrounding the law which had made Don Quixote required reading in elementary schools. Ortega made the following basic assumption: the aim of education is life, and since it is impossible to teach everything, priority areas of education must be defined. His teleological concept of action, which emerged in his idealistic stage and which he was never to abandon, made him wonder what education's purpose should be. If we have established that education must aim at life, then what is the essential of that life with which education must be concerned? The success of education, he believed, would depend on finding the right answer to this question.

Ortega considered that life, in its most basic sense, is elemental and spontaneous; he called it *natura naturans* as opposed to *natura naturata*. It is life as a creative force, the biological substratum from which all impulses and energies proceed, the spur to action. Thus life must be the primary focus of elementary education; later, the higher grades of the education system would provide education in civilization and culture, making the adult mind more specialized.

Ortega advanced a variety of arguments to support this thesis. The first of them was that in biological organisms some functions are more vital than others. The more radically vital functions are the unspecialized, unmechanized ones, those that are genuinely representative of life. Their lack of specialization enables them to provide answers to a multitude of changing situations; they are able to deal not only with a specific type of situation, but an extremely varied range of them.

The second of his arguments is that this primitive, radical life is the real creator of culture: 'The culture and civilization which fill us with such pride are a creation of savages, not of cultivated, civilized man'.[22] All of history's most creative periods, he said, have been preceded by an explosion of savagery. If we want a culture which is a real and dynamic source of human fulfilment, we must concentrate on the study, analysis and nurturing of this primary vitality, which will explode and create new forms of culture.

And this is where pedagogy comes in, since Ortega's vision of naturalism – as he himself confesses – is a far cry from Rousseau's. Pedagogy's role is to devise artifices which intensify this life, and education is no more than the application of these artifices. Children should not be left to develop according to their own devices, by imitating the processes of nature; educational actions are deliberate,

reflexive, aimed at the attainment of a goal: to co-operate technically in the maximization of the children's deepest and most vital potential. Education must be aimed not at the acquisition of cultural forms, but rather at the shaping of life itself, at the stimulation of the child's own vital power.

What are these spontaneous functions which must be stimulated? Ortega enumerates them: 'courage and curiosity, love and hate, intellectual agility, the will to enjoy and triumph, confidence in oneself and in the world, imagination, memory'.[23] These functions are like the internal secretions which dynamize the organism as an integral whole: if one of them is lacking, the entire organism is unable to function. They are for the psyche what the hormone is for the body: the basic substance, the catalyst.

What Ortega advocated was that elementary education should be aimed at ensuring vital health, since this is essential to overall health in the broad sense of the word: 'Elementary teaching should be constantly governed by the final purpose of producing the greatest number of vitally perfect human beings',[24] individuals in whom spiritual impulses well up in a torrent brimming with an energy which seems unaware of its own limitations, as if saturated with itself; individuals whose actions seem to overflow from their own inner abundance.

Despite appearances, Ortega was not advocating a naturalistic primitivism – as is made clear by his criticisms of Rousseau – nor did he support any sort of anticultural irrationalism. He had simply reassigned the role which he had previously conferred on culture as the basis and purpose of human life. Now he had gone the other way and incarnated culture in life, since – he believed – the purpose of culture was precisely to be a function of life: not life for culture, but culture for life. The life/culture equilibrium was tilted in favour of life, since life is what gives culture its value. The goal now would be to authenticate and incite culture, using life as the criterion of authenticity.

Ortega not only gave a fascinating description of two basic functions of this primitive, essential life – desire and feelings – but he also tentatively proposed ways of educating it. In order to develop children's vital impulses, they must be surrounded by feelings which are audacious and magnanimous, ambitious and enthusiastic. A key aspect of this approach to education was to provide the child not with facts but myths: myth, according to Ortega, awakens in us the currents induced by the feelings which nourish the vital pulse, which keep uppermost our desire to live and which increase the resilience of our deepest biological springs.

Another point to which he pays special attention is the need to educate children not as adults but as children; not from the standpoint of an ideal, model adult, but according to a model of childhood. Ortega criticizes us for judging children by our adult standards, for taking it for granted that they are living in the same vital medium as ourselves. The child lives in its own vital medium of non-utilitarian interests, which must be developed precisely since these interests frequently lead to the most vital orientations of its adult life. Thus 'the song of the poet and the word of the sage, the ambition of the politician and the deed of the warrior, are always echoes of an incorrigible child imprisoned within the

adult'.[25] The objects which exist vitally for children, which occupy and preoccupy them, which hold their attention and awaken their desires, their passions and their impulses, are not just material objects but objects of desire, whether material or not. They only interest children in so far as they are desirable; that is why they are drawn to stories and legends in which they can convert reality into an environment moulded to their desires.

Ortega's definitive and mature position was not the one we have just described, but rather the one he began to settle into in 1930, in his search for a balance between life and culture. Outside the framework of institutions, vital spontaneity degenerates into irresponsible primitivism and, conversely, institutions without vitality degenerate into routine and inertia.

The pedagogy of maturity

In his article, 'Un rasgo de la vida alemana' [An Aspect of German Life],[26] Ortega tells us that the individual has the potential to be an unlimited number of personalities but that when we look at actual individuals we see that their real possibilities are limited by the environment in which they live, a concrete cultural and social one, and as such it is the accumulation of what others before them have done. Culture and cultural objects are always borne out of the action of individuals, but once converted into objects they became de-individualized and assume a life of their own. This is why the possibilities really available to an individual are those which are provided by the de-individualized institution, which is both alien to and imposed upon the individual. This imposition has two sides: it is a constriction, a limitation; and it is what makes possible the creation of new individuals.

Life, like freedom, is always threatened precisely by that which makes it possible: culture. That is why life must rebel against culture, mistrust it – even if it does so precisely because culture is the basis for its security. It must criticize it and transcend it again and again, not make it more like nature, but to create new cultural configurations.

Consequently Ortega, in the opening lectures of his university courses, insisted that students had to begin with the culture in which they found themselves; however, in the same way as the creators of culture, they should analyse it critically, and see if the culture that had been produced up to that point satisfied them or if, on the contrary, they felt a vital need to change it. This, he said, is what true living consists of, living in the culture of one's time.[27] We can only say that we have found a truth when we have found a thought which satisfies a need felt by us. However, if students only feel the need to learn what others have discovered, they will at most only feel enthusiasm or pleasure, since their study will have been imposed on them – something artificial. This need is different from the need felt by those who created the new knowledge, who did so because they needed it to go on living, because it was a vital need. That is why Ortega proposes this interesting concept of teaching: 'Teaching is primarily and fundamentally nothing

but enabling students to feel the need of a science, and not teaching them a science for which they cannot be made to feel any need'.[28]

The kind of educational institutions which we must promote, therefore, are those driven by the constant need to find answers to the vital problems felt by the students, and in which freedom, democracy and modernity are the keywords. These are the educational institutions which Ortega proposes in one of his best known writings, *Misión de la Universidad* [The Mission of the University].[29]

He begins this work by delivering a diagnosis of the Spanish university as he sees it. What is the university today? His answer is: a centre of higher learning, where the children of the well-off – not the children of the working classes – are trained to take up intellectual professions, and where the teachers are obsessed with scientific research and with the training of future researchers.

Ortega finds much to criticize in this university: its élitism, since all those who could and should benefit from higher education do not do so; the lack of discernment of its research work, since it confuses the teaching and the learning of science with the discovery of truth and the demonstration of error; and, above all, its dereliction of duty in failing to teach culture, that is to say to transmit clear, firm ideas about the universe, to make positive statements about the nature of things and the world; in other words, it fails as an institution which teaches its students to live by the most advanced ideas of their time.

What is the university's mission in our time? Ortega answers: to transmit culture; to train for a profession; scientific research; and the education of new researchers. In this formulation of the university's mission Ortega does not seem to be adding much that is new. However, when we ask: What is the order of priorities for these functions? the relevance and stringency of his answers strikes us, even today, as remarkable. He defines the purpose of the university and, on that basis, he establishes his basic criterion: 'Instead of teaching what some Utopian longing would have us teach, we should teach only that which can be taught, in other words, that which can be learned'.[30] The educational approaches of Rousseau, Pestalozzi and Fröbel were novel in that they said priority should be given not to knowledge or to the teacher, but rather to the student, and specifically to the 'average student'.

The principle which must regulate university education, he tells us, is the 'principle of economy'. Teaching and the study of education would never have become such important occupations, or professions, if it had not been for the eighteenth century's great strides forward in science, technology and culture. In our times, in order to live with confidence and ease, we need to know an enormous number of things, even though our individual capacity for learning is extremely limited. Teachers and educational theorists select the essentials for the learning process, and make them easier to assimilate.

Everything must be based on the student, on his or her capacity to learn and on what he or she needs in order to live. In fact it is the *average* student who must be taken as the basis, and taught only that which can strictly and absolutely be required of him or her; in other words, what is required in order to live in and

keep abreast of one's times, material which he or she can learn thoroughly and with ease. On this basis, Ortega sets forth the following lemmas:

> The university consists, first and foremost, of the education which the average person should receive; above all, the average individual must be made into a cultured person, able to meet the challenges of the times . . .; the average student should be made into a good professional . . .; there is no valid reason why the average person should need to be, or should be, a scientist.[31]

The lemma on which Ortega centres his argument is that the university should teach culture. He defines culture as the system of living ideas belonging to each period: 'What I call living ideas, or the ideas on which we live, are those that contain our basic convictions regarding the nature of the world and our fellow human beings, the hierarchy of values for things and actions: which ones are worthy of esteem, which ones are less so.'[32] No one can live without reacting to their own environment or world, or drawing some conclusion regarding themselves and the ways in which they could conduct themselves in that world. It is this set of ideas, or conclusions, about the universe and human beings that the university must teach.

It is true that, in our times, the content of culture comes – for the greater part – from science; culture skims from science that which is vitally necessary to make sense of our existence, but there are whole areas of science which are not culture, but pure scientific technique. Man needs to live and culture is the interpretation of this life; life, which means human beings, cannot expect the sciences to explain the Universe scientifically; in order to live, we urgently need culture to give us a coherent, all-embracing, clearly-structured system of the Universe; and this culture has to be the culture of our time. Teaching this culture in the university calls for teachers who have the ability to grasp and communicate essentials in a systematic manner.

In Ortega's own words, the primary mission of the university is as follows.

> First, the university *stricto sensu* should be understood to mean an institution in which the average student is taught to be a cultured person and a competent professional; second, the university will not tolerate any kind of farce, in other words, it will not expect of students anything they are practically incapable of achieving; third, this will prevent students from wasting time pretending that they are going to be scientists. Scientific research as such will therefore be eliminated from core university courses; fourth, the disciplines of culture and professional studies will be offered in the way best suited to educational purposes (synthetic, systematic and complete), rather than in the form which science, left to its own devices, preferred in the past: special problems, 'chunks' of science, research efforts; fifth, the decisive factor in the choice of teachers shall not be their ability as researchers but, rather, their ability to grasp and communicate essentials and their gifts as teachers; sixth, after cutting this type of learning down to the minimum in quantity and quality, the university will be inexorable in its demands on the student.[33]

Ortega was aware (and explicitly made it known) that his opinions about scientific research and the training of researchers would not be well received. What he

could not accept was the farce of including scientific research and its supposed teaching in basic university courses. In order to make his position quite clear, he said: 'The university is distinct, but inseparable from science. I would say: the university is science too.'[34] Science is the basis for the existence of the university, without which it cannot live, since science is the soul of the university. But as well as being linked with science, the university needs to be in contact with public life, with historical reality, with the present. The university has to be interested in what is going on and take part in current events as a university, giving its own cultural, professional or scientific view on the major subjects of the day. Only then – concludes Ortega – will it once more become the university it was in its finest hour: a driving force of European history.

In 1936, the problem of Spain which so greatly concerned Ortega blossomed tragically into the Civil War and Ortega set out on his voluntary exile to South America and Europe. The following nineteen years, until his death, have been seen by some as a separate biographical period. Whether this is true or not, there can be no denying that his radical political commitment seems to have been shaken by this new set of 'circumstances'. However, his philosophical talent produced such outstanding works as: *Ideas y creencias* [Ideas and Beliefs] (1940); *La razón histórica* [Historical Reason], 1st part (1940) and 2nd part (1944); *La idea de principio en Leibnitz* [The Idea of Principle in Leibnitz] (1947); *El hombre y la gente* [The Individual and the People] (1949), etc. During these years he only left us one piece on education, *Apuntes sobre una educación para el futuro* [Notes on an Education for the Future] (1953), which he wrote as a paper to be read at a meeting held in London organized by the Fund for the Progress of Education. It does not, in my opinion, make a very significant contribution to his thinking on education.

Although Ortega's writings on education are one aspect – and I believe a significant one – of his philosophical thought, they do not present a systematic whole, since this was not in our author's character. Although we have not mentioned all of Ortega's works on education, I believe that we have analysed the three most important ones.

Ortega's dimensions as an educator

Analysis of Ortega's thinking on education clearly points to two underlying motivations. The first, which was the purpose of his entire work, was the transformation of the socio-cultural condition of Spain. The 'Spanish question', as it was called, constantly claimed his attention, spurring him to action in many ways: membership of the *Liga de Educación Política* (League of Political Education), the *Agrupación al Servicio de la República* (Association for Service to the Republic), constant contributions to public affairs in the form of lectures and articles in the press, election to Parliament, etc. The second, connected to the first, was that Ortega saw his vocation as that of a reformer, a shaper of the new society and of the new Spaniard. Since he considered himself – in my opinion,

rightly – to be a philosopher, he fulfilled his vocation basically by putting forward ideas which would be a spur to this transformation.

His influence as an educator spread out in many directions.[35] In the academic domain of Spanish philosophy he was the most influential personality of his day. The 'School of Madrid', as it was known, formed around him, attracted by his philosophy and personality. Figures as prestigious as Manuel García Morente, Zavier Zubiri and José Gaos all taught philosophy alongside Ortega at the University of Madrid. Any connoisseur of Spanish culture will recognize the importance of these names, and when we add to them the names of Luis Recaséns, María Zambrano, Ioaquín Xirau and Julian Marías – who for one reason or another were all linked to the School of Madrid – it becomes quite clear that Ortega, considered by all as their uncontested master, occupies a very special place in twentieth century Spanish philosophy.

Ortega's influence was not confined to other teachers and students who – during the philosophical golden age of the School of Madrid – looked to him as their master. He also influenced other major figures of Spanish philosophy and culture of the post-Civil War period, such as José Luis Aranguren and Pedro Laín Entralgo, a clear indication that his philosophy belongs squarely to the cultural tradition of our country.

In the domain of education it was his influence on Lorenzo Luzuriaga, whose involvement with Ortega began in 1908, when the latter began teaching at the Escuela Superior de Magisterio, that was most marked. From what we know, it would seem that the studies of the education section of the Universidad Central de Madrid were created (in 1932) on Ortega's initiative.[36] Another of Ortega's disciples, Ioaquín Xirau, was active in Catalonia in educational reform programmes aimed at developing the study of education as a scientific discipline. Yet another, María de Maeztu, followed the steps of the master to Marburg and studied social education under Natorp. She travelled widely in Europe to see the 'new schools' at first hand, and on that basis later developed a project for the reform of teaching methods in Spain.

In the extra-university context, Ortega created a large number of what Luzuriaga[37] called 'foundations', clearly attempting to exert an influence – through new ideas – on Spanish society. One of these foundations was the *Revista de occidente* [Western Review], which can be considered as the culmination of a process of constant trial and error. His previous experiences in cultural and political activities led him to conceive the *Revista de occidente* as a launching pad for the cultural transformation of Spain. He seems to have founded this review (and the publishing house of the same name) to cater to a readership with similar cultural approaches to his own and, ultimately, to create a cultural atmosphere in which his own writings could be read and discussed.

Lastly, I would like to mention the educational influence which Ortega had on the countries of the Southern Cone of South America (Argentina, Chile and Uruguay), where he found a community of shared values and feelings, and where his influence was to intensify when several other members of the School of

Madrid went into exile there during the Spanish Civil War. However, his influence was greatest in Puerto Rico, where the university applied several of the theories developed in the work, 'The University's Mission', and where many of Ortega's writings were used as textbooks.

Notes

1. José Ortega y Gasset, *Obras completas* [Complete Works], Madrid, Alianza Editorial Revista de Occidente, 1983, 12 vols. All quotations from the writings of Ortega y Gasset have been taken from this edition. The following notes give the title of the quoted text, and the volume and page number of the quotation in *Obras completas*.
2. 'A una edición de sus obras' [To an Edition of His Works], Vol. 6, p. 351.
3. P. Cerezo, *La voluntad de aventura* [The Desire for Adventure], pp. 15-87, Barcelona, Ariel, 1984.
4. 'Juan Vives y su mundo' [Juan Vives and His World], Vol. 9, pp. 509-15.
5. More detailed information can be found in two important works by his brilliant disciple Julian Marías, *Ortega: circunstancias y vocación* [Ortega: Circumstances and Vocation], Madrid, Revista de Occidente, 1973, and *Ortega: las trayectorias* [Ortega: The Trajectories], Madrid, Alianza Universidad, 1984. His daughter, María Ortega, has provided a valuable contribution with her work, *Ortega y Gasset, mi padre* [Ortega y Gasset, My Father], Barcelona, Planeta.
6. An overall view of these influences is presented in S. Rábade, *Ortega y Gasset, filósofo. Hombre, conocimiento y razón* [The Philospher, Ortega y Gasset: Man, Consciousness and Reason], pp. 37-49, Madrid, Humanitas, 1983. The work of Cerezo, mentioned above, offers a more detailed study; chapters IV and VI are especially interesting.
7. 'Al margen del libro "A.M.D.G."' [Marginal Note to the Book 'A.M.D.G.'], Vol. 1, pp. 532-34.
8. 'Una fiesta de paz' [A Festival of Peace], Vol. 1, p. 125.
9. 'Vieja y nueva politica' [Old and New Policies], Vol. 1, p. 268.
10. Charles Cascalés, *L'humanisme d'Ortega y Gasset* [Ortega y Gasset's Humanism], p. 3, Paris, P.U.F., 1957.
11. 'Una primera vista sobre Baroja' [A First Glance at Baroja], Vol. 2, p. 118.
12. 'Prólogo para alemanes' [Prologue for Germans], Vol. 8, p. 26.
13. 'A una edición de sus obras', op. cit., p. 347.
14. José Ferrater Mora distinguishes three stages: objectivism (1912-14); perspectivism (1914-23); and raciovitalism (1924-55). José Gaos, his main disciple before the Spanish Civil War, identifies four periods: youth (1902-14); first stage of maturity (1914-23); second stage of maturity (1924-36); and expatriation (1936-55). Similar classifications have been proposed by Morón Arroyo and Pedro Cerezo, among others.
15. 'La pedagogía social como programa político' [Social Education as a Political Programme], Vol. 1, pp. 503-21.
16. Ibid., p. 514.
17. Ibid., p. 516.

18. J. Mantovani, *Filósofos y educadores* [Philosophers and Educators], p. 61, Buenos Aires, El Ateneo, 1962.
19. 'La pedagogía social como programa político', op. cit., p. 515.
20. '¿Qué es filosofía?' [What is Philosophy?], Vol. 7, p. 405.
21. 'Ensayos filosóficos. Biología y pedagogía' [Philosophical Essays: Biology and Education], Vol. 2, pp. 271-305.
22. Ibid., p. 280.
23. Ibid., p. 278.
24. Ibid., p. 292.
25. Ibid., p. 300.
26. 'Un rasgo de la vida alemana' [An Aspect of German Life], Vol. 5, pp. 199-203.
27. 'Sobre las carreras' [About Careers], Vol. 5, p. 179.
28. 'Sobre el estudiar y el estudiante' [About Studying and the Student], Vol. 4, p. 554.
29. 'Misión de la Universidad' [The University's Mission], Vol. 4, pp. 311-53.
30. Ibid., p. 327.
31. Ibid., p. 335.
32. Ibid., p. 341.
33. Ibid., p. 349.
34. Ibid., p. 351.
35. J. L. Abellan, *Historia crítica del pensamiento español* [An Analytical History of Spanish Thought], Vol. 5 (3), pp. 212-81, Madrid, Espasa Calpe, 1991.
36. I. Zuloaga, 'La pedagogía universitaria según Ortega y Gasset' [University Education according to Ortega y Gasset], in *Homenaje a José Ortega y Gasset (1883-1983)*, pp. 23-42, Madrid, Universidad Complutense, 1986.
37. L. Luzuriaga, 'Las Fundaciones de Ortega y Gasset' [The Fundamentals of Ortega y Gasset], in *Homenaje a Ortega y Gasset*, pp. 33-50, Madrid, Edime, 1958.

Works on education by José Ortega y Gasset

IN CHRONOLOGICAL ORDER

1906. 'La Pedagogía del paisaje' [Teaching via the Landscape]. In: *El Imparcial* (Madrid), 17 September. (*Obras completas*, Vol. 1, pp. 53-57, Madrid, Alianza Editorial – Revista de Occidente, 1983.)
1910. *La pedagogía social como programa político* [Social Education as a Political Programme]. Lecture given to the 'El Sitio' Society in Bilbao on 12 March. (*Obras completas*, op. cit., Vol. 1, pp. 503-21.)
1913. *La hora del maestro* [The Teacher's Hour].
1914. 'Preface.' In: J.F. Herbart, *Pedagogía General* [General Education]. (Transl. by Lorenzo Luzuriaga.) (*Obras completas*, op. cit., Vol. 6, pp. 265-91.)
1917. *La pedagogía de la contaminación* [Education by Contamination].
1923. 'Biología y pedagogía' [Biology and education]. In: *El Sol* (Madrid), beginning on 16 March. (*Obras completas*, op. cit., Vol. 3, pp. 13133.)
1923. 'Pedagogía y anacronismo' [Teaching and Anachronism]. In: *Revista de Pedagogía* (Madrid), January.
1925. *Elogio de las virtudes de la mocedad* [In Praise of the Virtues of Youth].
1928. *Para los niños españoles* [For Spanish Children].

1930. *Misión de la Universidad* [The Mission of the University]. Text of a lecture given at the Universidad Central de Madrid. Madrid, Revista de Occidente. (*Obras completas*, op. cit., Vol. 4, pp. 313-53]

1931. *En el centenario de una universidad* [On the Centenary of the University]. Lecture given at the University of Granada. (*Obras completas*, op. cit., Vol. 5, pp. 463-73]

1933. 'Sobre el estudiar y el estudiante' [On Studying and the Student]. *La Nación* (Buenos Aires), 23 April. (*Obras completas*, op. cit., Vol. 4, pp. 545-54.)

1934. 'Sobre las carreras' [On Careers]. In: *La Nación* (Buenos Aires), Sept.-Oct., 1934. (*Obras completas*, op. cit., Vol. 5, pp. 167-83.)

1952. *Apuntes para una educación del futuro* [Annotations for Future Education]. Contributions to the debates of the Fund for the Progress of Education, London, May. (*Obras completas*, op. cit., Vol. 9, pp. 665-75.)

Works on the educational thought of Ortega y Gasset

Barcena, F. 'La dimensión educativa del problema de la verdad en el pensamiento de José Ortega y Gasset' [The Educational Dimension of the Problem of Truth in the Thinking of José Ortega y Gasset]. *Revista Española de Pedagogía* (Madrid), No. 160, 1983, pp. 311-24.

Barrena Sanchez, J. 'Los fines de la educación en José Ortega y Gasset' [The Purpose of Education in José Ortega y Gasset]. *Revista Expañola de Pedagogía* (Madrid), No. 116, 1971, pp. 393-414.

Escolano, A. 'Los temas educativos en la obra de J. Ortega y Gasset' [Educational Themes in the Work of J. Ortega y Gasset]. *Revista Española de Pedagogía* (Madrid), No. 113, 1968, pp. 211-30.

García Morente, M. 'La pedagogía de Ortega y Gasset' [Ortega y Gasset's Educational Approach]. *Revista de Pedagogía* (Madrid), Nos. 2-3, 1922, pp. 41-47 and 95-101.

Gutierrez Zuloaga, I. 'La pedagogía universitaria según Ortega y Gasset' [University Education according to Ortega y Gasset]. In: *Homenaje a José Ortega y Gasset (1883-1983)*, pp. 23-42, Madrid, Universidad Complutense, 1986.

McClintock, R. M. *Man and His Circumstances: Ortega as Educator.* New York City, Teacher's College, Columbia University Press, 1971.

Maillo, A. 'Las ideas pedagógicas de Ortega y Gasset' [Ortega y Gasset's Educational Ideas]. *Revista de Educación* (Madrid), No. 4, 1955, pp. 71-78.

Mantovani, J. 'La pedagogía de Ortega y Gasset' [Ortega y Gasset's Educational Approaches]. In: *Filósofos y educadores*, pp. 55-74, Buenos Aires, El Ateneo, 1962.

Santolaria, F. F. 'Tres ensayos pedagógicos de Ortega' [Three Educational Essays by Ortega]. *Perspectivas pedagógicas* (Madrid), No. 51, 1983, pp. 501-10.

Zaragüeta, J. 'El pensamiento pedagógico de José Ortega y Gasset' [José Ortega y Gasset's Educational Thinking]. *Revista de Educación* (Madrid), No. 38, 1990, pp. 65-70.

ROBERT OWEN

(1771–1858)

Peter Gordon

Robert Owen's contribution to the advancement of educational thought and practice is widely acknowledged in textbooks on the history of education. But this, though perhaps one of his main achievements, by no means exhausts them. With his eager, questioning mind and superabundant energy, he explored other aspects of society which he considered required attention and investigation. These included his schemes to establish an enlightened pattern of industrial life to ameliorate many of the problems caused by the Industrial Revolution; experiments with community organization as a basis for international regeneration; and plans to establish a British labour movement with a Grand National Consolidated Trades Union. Many of his notions were taken up and transformed by followers who were termed Owenites and who believed that the economic and social structure could be changed in accordance with the laws of social science.

Effects of the Industrial Revolution

Robert Owen was born in 1771 at Newtown, Montgomeryshire, in Wales. His education was very modest, though by the age of 7 he was already a pupil-teacher and he left school for good two years later. With his business acumen and intelligence, Owen quickly rose to prominence in the industrial world. After a few years' apprenticeship as a draper in London, he migrated to Manchester in the late 1780s and, at the age of 18, set up his own business.

Owen arrived in a town which had, like many other British northern urban centres, been greatly changed by the advent of the Industrial Revolution in the mid-eighteenth century. The invention of Watt's steam engine and those machines connected with the cotton industry, particularly Richard Arkwright's water frame, changed such work from the domestic to the factory scale. The population of Manchester increased by a 1,000 per cent from 25,000 at the time of Owen's birth to nearly a quarter of a million fifty years later. The demand for

labour by the cotton mills was insatiable. The north of England, with its scattered population, could not supply a sufficient work-force. The Overseers of the Poor, especially in London and the south, in order to be relieved of the growing burden of supporting the poor from local taxes, offered batches of children from the workhouses to factories in the north. These apprentice children were consigned to their employers from the age of 7, living next door to the mill in 'prentice-houses'. Besides the often miserable living conditions they had to endure, they laboured from 5 a.m. to 8 p.m. with half-hour breaks for breakfast and dinner (Hammond and Hammond, 1949).

In 1802 the Health and Moral of Apprentices Act became law in an attempt to protect the young. It provided, among other things, that children's work should be limited to twelve hours a day and that they should receive some form of elementary education. Sir Robert Peel, himself a factory owner and the promoter of the Act, subsequently admitted in the House of Commons that employers and magistrates were rendering the Act inoperative: children were working thirteen or fourteen hours a day at the age of 7 years, and in some cases even younger.

Intellectual influences

Whilst at Manchester, Owen took part in discussions at the Manchester Literacy and Philosophical Society and took the chair for Joseph Lancaster's meetings on the 'Lancasterian' system of elementary education, making at one stage a contribution of £1,000 to the latter. He joined with John Dalton, founder of the atomic theory, and others to form the Manchester College in the early 1790s; at one of the discussions, he clashed with the young Samuel Taylor Coleridge.

It is not easy to trace the sources of Owen's intellectual philosophy. He had lost his belief in Christianity in early youth and concluded, after studying the history of the human race, that man was 'the necessary result of his organization and the conditions by which nature and society surrounded him'. He became an active member of the Manchester Board of Health, set up by his friend Dr Thomas Percival in 1796 and which was concerned with improving the health and sanitation of people living in the industrialized city (M. Cole, 1971). Through Percival's influence, Owen became aware of the French philosophers of the Enlightenment, such as Voltaire, Diderot, Condorcet and Rousseau. His meeting with William Godwin later reinforced his views. Of even more significance was his move to Scotland. In his autobiography, Owen mentions that he was on friendly terms with many of the professors of the Scottish universities of Edinburgh and Glasgow, one of whom, George Jardine, a friend of Helvétius and d'Alembert, attempted to relate the study of philosophy 'to the business of active life' and encouraged his students to participate in the organization of their own courses (Stewart and McCann, 1967). On a more general level, the Scottish university tradition was then the benefactor of an intellectual renaissance in moral philosophy during the second half of the eighteenth century with the writings of

David Hume, Adam Smith and Patrick Colquhoun. The blending of the views of the French and Scottish Enlightenment, as well as his own experiences in Manchester, were to form the basis for Owen's own theories of education.

A new view of society

After eight years in Manchester, where Owen had accumulated much wealth and experience, he acquired in 1799 the management of the 'very wretched society' of New Lanark on the River Clyde, which had the largest spinning mills in Scotland. The mills were owned by David Dale, a strong Presbyterian and a Tory. With his business partners, Owen, at the age of 27, acquired the mills; he also married one of Dale's daughters. He was determined to introduce a more humane regime which would bring about a change in the character and dignity of individual members of the work-force. Treated at first with natural suspicion, both as an employer and a non-Scot, Owen soon overcame these difficulties. As he later claimed from his Manchester experience:

> My treatment of all with whom I came into communication was so natural that it generally gained their confidence, and drew forth only their good qualities to me; and I was often much surprised to discover how much more easily I accomplished my objects than others whose educated acquirements were much superior to mine. . . . In consequence of this to me unconscious power over others, I had produced such effects over the workpeople in the factory in the first six months of my management that I had the most complete influence over them, and their order and discipline exceeded that of any other in or near Manchester; and for regularity and sobriety they were an example which none could then imitate [R. Owen, 1858].

Owen aimed at making New Lanark a well-governed community based on his ideals. Dale had laid the foundations earlier for his future son-in-law by paying attention to the physical conditions of the pauper children in his factories and in providing some modest form of infant education. Owen hoped to carry out an experiment in social living. No child under 10 was employed in the factories; he abolished pauper apprentice labour and greatly improved the factory conditions of his work force. Commercial success resulted. Although his own venture had proved satisfactory, Owen realized that by being a benevolent autocrat, the underlying problem of social malaise could only be ameliorated rather than solved. He wrote:

> As employer and master manufacturer in Lancashire and Lanarkshire, I had done all I could to lighten the evils of those whom I employed; yet with all I could do under our most irrational system for creating wealth, forming character, and conducting all human affairs, I could only to a limited extent alleviate the wretchedness of their conditions, while I knew that society, even at this period, possessed the most ample means to educate, employ, place, and govern, the whole population of the British Empire, so as to make all into fully-formed, highly intelligent, united, and permanently prosperous and happy men and women, superior in all physical and mental qualities [R. Owen, 1858].

How to achieve this end occupied Owen during the first decade at New Lanark. He outlined his proposals for reform in a book *A New View of Society, or Essays on the Principle of the Formation of the Human Character, and the Application of the Principle to Practice* in 1813 and 1814. The first two *Essays* dealt with the need to consider rationally forming the character 'of that immense mass of population which is now allowed to be so formed as to fill the world with crimes'. The third *Essay* was an account of the progress made at New Lanark for the further improvement of its inhabitants. It is here that Owen expounds his view of the importance of education.

Much good or evil is acquired or taught to children at an early age. Many 'durable impressions' are made even in the first year of a child's life. Therefore children uninstructed or badly instructed suffer injury in their character during their childhood and youth. It was in order to prevent this that the workers' young children were to receive Owen's closest attention. In the playground which was built for them at New Lanark the child would be told upon entrance in language he could understand that 'he was never to injure his play-fellows: but that, on the contrary, he is to contribute all in his power to make him happy'. If this simple precept was followed – and the employment of superintendents was to ensure that there would be no deviation from it – then this behaviour would in time be transmitted to the population as a whole.

Owen had earlier, as has been seen, been an admirer of the Lancasterian monitorial system of education, and the first two *Essays*, written in 1812 and 1813, reflect these principles of obedience, order, regularity, industry and constant attention rather than the need to read, write and calculate. Now in the third and fourth *Essays*, written in 1814, his views had changed considerably:

> Either give the poor a rational and useful learning or mock not their ignorance, their poverty, and their misery, by merely instructing them to become conscious of the extent of their degradation under which they exist. And therefore, in pity to suffering humanity, either keep the poor, if you now can, in the state of the most abject ignorance, as near as possible to animal life, or at once determine to form them into rational beings, into useful and effective members of the state.

To this end, Owen prescribed that the curriculum should be the best possible, eschewing traditional attitudes towards the education of the poor. Recognizing that each child had different aptitudes and qualities, he later pointed out that the intention of his system was not to attempt to make all human beings alike. Education was to make everybody 'good, wise and happy'. Owen did not simply equate education with schooling. The role of parents in the process was stressed: the mother from the birth of a child onwards, and certainly in the early years, was a key figure and both parents were urged to display great kindness in manners and feeling.

However, it was not enough to leave to employers and parents the task of raising children in the ways set out by Owen in his fourth *Essay*. It was the most important duty of the well-governed state that it should establish a national

system of education for the poor, uniform over the United Kingdom. Whilst praising both Bell and Lancaster's pioneering efforts in this field, Owen criticized their pedagogical approaches. Reading and writing are merely instruments by which knowledge may be imparted: they are of little value unless children are taught to make proper use of them. 'The *manner* of giving instruction is one thing, the *instruction itself* another; and no two objects can be more distinct.' It is therefore, important to adopt the best manner of instruction whereby a child can understand the objects and characters around him.

Owen's dissatisfaction with the existing provision of education was voiced in unambiguous terms:

> enter any one of the schools denominated national, and request the master to show the acquirements of the children. These are called out, and he asks them theological questions to which men of the most profound erudition cannot make a rational reply; the children, however, readily answer as they had been previously instructed; for memory, in this mockery of learning, is all that is required. Thus the child whose natural faculty of comparing ideas, or whose rational powers, shall be the soonest destroyed, if at the same time, he possess a memory to retain incongruities without connection, will become what is termed the first scholar in the class; and three-fourths of the time which ought to be devoted to the acquirement of useful instruction will be really occupied in destroying the mental power of the children [R. Owen, 1814].

His vision of a system of education for the poor and labouring classes was based on the doctrine that 'the state that possesses the best national system of education will be the best governed'. To achieve this end, Owen set out the contents of an Act which Parliament should agree to. It consisted of several far-sighted and comprehensive proposals. These included the establishment of a Ministry for Education staffed by able people; teacher-training colleges – 'at present there are not any individuals in the kingdom who have been trained to instruct the rising generation'; an overall plan for the manner of instruction, based on a comparison of the various practices of the time; and the appointment to schools of suitable masters by the state. Owen believed that it was also necessary to give accurate information about the actual number of workers in each district, their occupations and the extent of unemployment.

Although some of Owen's ideas on education are at times idiosyncratic and exaggerated, they are basically sound and far-sighted. For example in his second *Essay*, he explains that 'children are, without exception, passive and wonderfully contrived compounds, which by due preparation and accurate attention, founded on a correct knowledge of the subject, may be formed collectively into any human character'.

This passage clearly shows that Owen was not simply a believer in environment as the main determinant of character, but that training, in the form of education, was equally important. On the other hand, as character is formed in infancy, before the child's second year, no general reformation of character is possible unless the foundations of a system of moral education had already been

laid. For the development of a well-balanced child, schooling should not begin too early, and when it does begin there should be a large element of recreation and amusement. It was for this reason that children at New Lanark did not start school below the age of 5.

As we shall later see, Owen's views on community coloured his social and economic philosophy and activity. In *A New View of Society*, he advanced the view that each individual is not simply a product of his training and environment, but that societies collectively are the product of the forms of training and of social environment in which their members are brought up to adulthood. Society as a whole can inspire in its members a common basis for moral belief (G. D. H. Cole, 1965).

Another aspect of Owen's novel approach to education was that it should be a common right of all children, though his advocacy was in favour of the poorest people in the community. It was for this reason that he refused to employ children in his mills under the age of 10 and reduced the hours of older children in order that they could benefit from the evening classes which he also provided.

Owen did not take a wholly detached view of the benefits that could accrue from his enlightened approach. One result of his beneficence at New Lanark, he wrote in this third *Essay*, was that 'the time and money so spent, even while such improvements are in progress only, and but half their beneficial results attained, are now producing a return exceeding 50 per cent, and will shortly create profits equal to 100 per cent on the original capital expended in these mental improvements.' He overstated the case when he declared that 'man's character is made for, and not by him' and perhaps understated the importance of nurture in the educational process.

Nevertheless, *A New View of Society* represents a manifesto for a reappraisal of the function and consequences of child education. The emphasis on the moral basis of education is one widely accepted by current educational thought. His explanation of the formation of character is of interest and the need for healthy recreation and happiness for young children, with the provision of playgrounds for this purpose, has long been accepted during the early years of primary education.

New Lanark and its schools

A New View of Society quickly went through five editions and was also translated into French and German. Now a figure of national significance, Owen determined to put some of his own theories into practice.

He had a good basis on which to build his own vision of education. David Dale, the previous owner of New Lanark and Owen's father-in-law, had in 1785 established the mills on enlightened lines. Dale believed in the necessity of protecting the health and morals of the 500 young children who worked in his factory, aged between 6 and 16; they were housed in six dormitories (albeit sleeping three to a bed), and were well clothed and fed. They worked from 6 a.m. to 7

p.m. and after supper attended classes. There were sixteen teachers, including a writing master, a music master and a sewing mistress, though standards were not high. Owen criticized Dale's efforts on two grounds: that pupils working daily in the mills for eleven-and-a-half hours were not able to take full advantage of the provision, and that the starting age was too early. Dale also provided two schools, similar to infant and nursery care, for those too young to work: they were the first of their kind in the British Isles (Stewart and McCann, 1967).

Owen spent the first twelve years at New Lanark remodelling the factory and improving the life of the villagers. However, by 1809, his partners in the enterprise had revolted against Owen's apparent extravagance and had resigned. His new partners from the end of 1813 were William Allen and other Quakers, and Jeremy Bentham. One of the provisions among the articles of partnership was for establishing schools 'on the best models of the British system, or other approved system to which the partners may agree'. He was now ready to realize his ambition. A two-storey school was built, the upper floor divided into two rooms for the 6- to 14-year-olds; the first was fitted with forms and desks, as with the Lancasterian system, the other with natural objects, pictures and maps, and could also be used for singing and dancing. The ground floor was devoted to infant teaching, there being three rooms. Maximum use was made of the building: it was used by children during the day and by adults in the evening. Some 300 children were educated at the school, with boys and girls in the same classes.

The infant school, part of the Institution for the Formation of Character, was opened on 2 January 1816, claiming to be the first of its kind in Great Britain. Owen appointed as a teacher James Buchanan, a former weaver, and an assistant, Molly Young, then aged 17, both of them from New Lanark. The qualities which Owen looked for were a love of children and willingness to follow his own instructions. No corporal punishment was to be administered, no harsh words were to be uttered by the teachers and the children were not to be 'annoyed with books'. The young were encouraged to ask questions when their curiosity was aroused and, above all, they were to be happy. There were no prizes or punishments. Robert Dale Owen, Owen's son, has left an account of life in the infant school:

> They were trained to habits of order and cleanliness; they were taught to abstain from quarrels, to be kind to each other. They were amused with children's games, and with stories suited to their capacity. Two large, airy rooms were set apart, one for those under four years, and one for those from four to six. This last room was furnished with paintings, chiefly of animals, and a few maps. It was also supplied with natural objects from the gardens, fields and woods. These suggested themes for conversation, and brief familiar lectures; but there was nothing formal, no tasks to be learned, no readings from books (R. D. Owen, 1874).

James Buchanan, a gifted teacher, worked out his own programme for amusing his charges. He played the flute and the children would march behind him down to the bank of the River Clyde, where they were allowed to play, and then

marched back to school. Singing, dancing and an appreciation of natural objects were encouraged (Smith, 1931). There was also gymnastics, which involved clapping hands and counting numbers. Buchanan, unlike Owen, believed that young children should have some religious knowledge. Owen's business partners and the children's parents demanded that religious instruction should be given. Hymn books and Bibles were subsequently purchased for the school (Browning, 1971). After two years, Owen himself was a frequent visitor and took great pride in the proceedings. One visitor to New Lanark, who witnessed such an occasion, wrote: 'The little creatures run in groups to seize their benefactor by the hand, or to pull him by the coat, with the most artless simplicity.'

A modern curriculum consisted of the three Rs (reading, writing and arithmetic), sewing, history, both ancient and modern, geography, botany and geology. Natural history was emphasized and the pupils collected botanical and geological specimens from the surrounding countryside and displayed them in their classrooms. Owen employed a London teacher to paint large canvasses of subjects from natural history and the history of nations which were hung on rollers. Music also played an important part, together with singing and dancing; songs and dances of different countries were taught and choirs of some 150 children gave performances. Although textbooks were not plentiful, Maria Edgeworth's books were acceptable because of their high moral content.

Exercise was provided by marching and drilling in the playground. Not only would this contribute to the health and spirit of the boys: Owen stipulated that, under the supervision of an appropriate instructor, firearms 'of proportionate weight and size to the age and strength of the boys, shall be provided for them, when also they might be taught to practice and understand the more complicated military movements'.

Several interesting pedagogical techniques were used. Small blocks of wood were employed to help the child in understanding addition and subtraction. Word-and-picture cards assisted in the teaching of reading, and brass letters were available for learning the alphabet. With the older children, parts of speech and grammatical principles were visually depicted as members of the Army, such as General Noun, Colonel Verb, Corporal Adverb and so on. Arithmetic was taught by means of the Pestalozzian table of units and the theory of fractions from the table of squares, where each square was divided up into a number of equal parts. Most subjects in the arts and sciences in the upper school were taught by means of lectures to large groups. In contrast, the pupils were taken out on visits which could sometimes only marginally be labelled as educational.

Perhaps one of the best known examples of the school's enlightened teaching techniques was geography, which occupied a prominent place in the curriculum. It had two main objectives: to show the relationship between environment and character (the basis of the early-twentieth-century approach to the subject) and to give children a sense of geographical location. Pupils stood in a circle round a large map of the world which contained circles with the names of cites and towns omitted. The children used a pointer to challenge each other and

all would have a turn. Owen later stated that 'one of our Admirals, who had sailed round the world, said he could not answer many of the questions which some of these children not six years old readily replied to'. Lessons lasted no more than forty-five minutes each, the children attending for five-and-a-half hours per day. As for clothing, Owen stipulated that it was important that the children should be able to move freely. To this end, they were to wear either Roman-like white togas or Highland dress, including kilts.

A continuation of this education for those who left school at the age of 10 was available in evening classes, with an average of 400 attending. The curriculum was similar to that of the day school. Adults too were able to attend these classes. There were also weekly lectures on chemistry and mechanics and, for recreation, music and dancing (Silver, 1965).

The institution attracted a range of visitors of distinction in many different walks of life. Between 1815 and 1825, there were 20,000 names inscribed in the visitors' book. Owen, at the height of his popularity, could boast that he had shown the New Lanark schools to, among others, Prince Esterhazy, the Czar of Russia, the Grand Duke Nicholas, Brougham, Canning, Cobbett, Malthus, James Mill, Francis Place and Ricardo (Jeffreys, 1952).

Owen's views on education were derived from a number of different sources. His idea of 'natural' rewards and punishments was clearly derived from Rousseau. Bentham had earlier postulated the notion of infant schools and he may have known of Fellenberg's work from an account published in William Allen's periodical *The Philanthropist* in 1813. Godwin's views on the idea of progress, derived from Helvétius, was another source with its belief that man's character is the result of his intellectual and moral environment and that it could be improved by training. David Williams, a political radical who was influenced by Rousseau and had established a school in Chelsea in 1774, was another obvious influence. Two years after opening the Institution for the Formation of Character at New Lanark, Owen visited the continent of Europe, meeting several leading educationists. Owen, no modest man, wrote: 'My public proceedings at this period [1817] were considered to be several hundreds, some said thousands of years, in advance of that period.'

After visiting notable people in France, Owen travelled to Switzerland, where he spent some time observing three well-known schools for the poor. Oberlin, who had set up a school at Fribourg, lacked an infant department. At Yverdon, he visited Pestalozzi, 'another good and benevolent man'. Owen believed that 'his theory was good, but his means and experiences were very limited, and his principles were those of the old system', though he admitted that the school was more advanced than others. As was previously mentioned, however, Owen subsequently adopted the Pestalozzian method of arithmetic for his own schools. The last visit, of three days' duration, was to meet Fellenberg at Hofwyl. Owen was greatly impressed by him, calling him 'a man of no ordinary mould' who ran his establishment on democratic lines. In exchange, Fellenberg stated his admiration for the New Lanark system, though there were no boys under 10 in

his school. Owen was so impressed with Fellenberg that he sent his two eldest sons, Robert Dale and William, aged 16 and 14 years respectively, to finish their education with him.

Probably the answer to the origins of Owen's educational thought is that given by G. D. H. Cole in his *The Life of Robert Owen*, that he owed very little to others, arriving at largely similar conclusions with other pioneers by a different road based on his own experience and peculiar philosophy of character (G. D. H. Cole, 1965).

After the initial success of the schools, difficulties arose. In 1819 two of his Quaker partners, William Allen and Joseph Foster, visited New Lanark to investigate the claim that dancing and music were taking precedence over religion. One of the methods used to discredit Owen was instituted by a committee of factory owners set up when Owen was fighting to improve a Factory Bill which was then before Parliament. The New Lanark clergyman, Mr Menzies, was ordered to keep a watch over Owen and reported to the factory owners in London: subsequently rumours about his irreligiousness began to be circulated.

Although Owen brushed these charges aside, he was eventually, in January 1824, forced to sign an agreement that ended his connection with the school. Weekly readings of the scriptures were instituted and dancing became a paying subject only. The wearing of kilts for boys over 6 was banned, as was singing. Many of the teachers were dismissed and one of the new appointments was a master trained in the Lancasterian system. One redeeming feature was that Allen introduced lectures on chemistry, mechanics and other scientific subjects into the curriculum. Owen now resigned from the management of the institution and thus this valuable experiment came to an end.

Despite these setbacks, Owen had provided inspiration for others who followed. In December 1818, Lord Brougham, impressed with Owen's endeavours, discussed with the latter the possibility of setting up an infant school at Westminster in London. A committee, consisting of Brougham, James Mill and Zachary Macaulay, the famous historian's father, was formed and £1,000 collected. Accordingly, a school was opened at Westminster with James Buchanan, Owen's former New Lanark teacher, in charge. Buchanan carried on from where he had left off at New Lanark. He remained there until 1822, when he moved to new premises.

During his time at Westminster, Buchanan was introduced to Samuel Wilderspin, who was offered the superintendence of a second infant school, at Spitalfields in eastern London. This school, opened in 1820, was conducted on similar lines to that of Owen's, with the young child at the centre of the educational process. Wilderspin, who created a national network of infant schools, acknowledged Owen's contribution to the development of the system as well as giving him personal help, but as a covert Swedenborgian, Wilderspin disagreed with Owen's philosophy. There was, however, a large measure of agreement as to how an infant school should be organized (McCann and Young, 1982). In Scotland, David Stow, a young Glaswegian merchant, was inspired by Owen to

open a school in that city in 1816 for poor children, employing the 'picturing out' method in his lessons to capture the interest and imagination of his pupils (Smith, 1931). He also pointed out, for the first time, the difference between instruction and training. Ten years later, Stow founded the Glasgow Infant Society and began to train infant school-teachers.

While it is true that Owen's influence at New Lanark, and that of his disciples Buchanan, Stow and Wilderspin, generated a climate suitable for the encouragement of infant education, there was no great enthusiasm to introduce it at the national level. The real impetus for this came from a different source – the acceptance of Continental reformers, particularly Pestalozzi and Fröbel, through the advocacy of Dr Charles Mayo from the 1820s onwards.

The New Harmony experiment

The economic and social distress that immediately followed the Napoleonic Wars was a spur to action for Owen. At the end of his Continental visits to schools, he attended the conference of Great Powers at Aix-la-Chapelle and presented to it his *Two Memorials on Behalf of the Working Classes*. In them he pleaded for international action to restore the purchasing power of the workers and to establish schemes of education for the development of character. Two years later, in his *Address to the Working Classes* (1819), he reiterated his plan to set up an agricultural village, which he himself would superintend, and which would be self-supporting and based on communitarian principles. This plan was further elaborated two years' later in his *Report to the County of Lanark*. One of the principal features was the education of the children who 'shall be trained as though they were literally all of one family'. There would be two schools, one for 2- to 6-year-olds and one for those aged 6 to 12. The children were to be trained to acquire useful knowledge which would 'supersede the present defective and tiresome system of book learning'. Training and education, Owen insisted, must be viewed as intimately connected with the employment available in the village.

G. D. H. Cole has called the *Report to the County of Lanark* the real beginning of Owenism as a social, or socialist, system (G. D. H. Cole, 1965). 'The natural standard of value', Owen stated, 'is in principle human labour, on the combined manual and mental power of men called into action.' Under Owen's system, there would be a new standard of value based on productive power in which the producer should have a fair proportion of the wealth he creates. Owen's Villages of Co-operation, as he called them, would be based on the principle of united labour, expenditure and property, and equal privileges. Agriculture would take priority over manufacture – it was to be essentially a 'spade culture' – and the evils of the division of labour eliminated.

Owen had attempted to gain a wider platform for his views by standing for Parliament when a vacancy occurred for Lanark Burghs in 1819 and at the General Election in 1820, but on both occasions he was unsuccessful. Nevertheless, an opportunity later presented itself for Owen to carry out his

community experiment. In the summer of 1824, Richard Flower, an Englishman, visited Owen from the United States of America. Flower had been instructed by the Harmony Society, a community consisting of emigrant German peasants founded by George Rapp, to sell their property, consisting of 20,000 acres of uncultivated land in Indiana, on the banks of the Wabash river. Owen had known of the Rappites, who followed the principles of combined labour and expenditure, as early as 1815. Seeing the possibilities, Owen bought the village and land in April 1825.

Owen delivered an address in Washington, where his fame had already preceded him: in one of the audiences was the President of the United States, John Quincy Adams, as well as several members of Congress. People flocked to Harmony, now called New Harmony, from all parts of the country. Some 800 arrived in the first few weeks, not all for altruistic reasons. Owen personally directed the community. In January 1826, on his return from a visit to England, Owen, who was pleased with progress made in the experiment, drew up the articles of union entitled 'The New Harmony Community of Equality'. All members of the community were to be considered as one family, receiving similar food, clothing and education and were to be accommodated in similar houses.

One of the men whom Owen had brought back with him was William Maclure, a Scotsman with a passionate enthusiasm for popular education. A man of great wealth, Maclure agreed to advance some of the capital required to set up an agricultural school for the children of the poor, similar to that of Fellenberg's. Owen had already established a school at New Harmony for some 130 children who were boarded, clothed and educated at public expense. Maclure now took charge. The schools henceforth were run as a separate undertaking under the name of the Education Society. Maclure, to combat idleness among the pupils and to help to pay for their subsistence, purchased from Owen 900 acres of land on which the children laboured. Soon there were more than 400 pupils from the age of 2 upwards. Owen's two sons were employed as teachers.

The schools – boys and girls were separated – were boarding institutions. A disused church became a workshop for boys who were intending to become joiners and shoemakers. They slept on the floor above the church in cribs, three to a row, so their places of instruction and sleeping accommodation were very close together. A former pupil of the girls' school wrote an account of her time at New Harmony:

> In summer the girls wore dresses of coarse linen with a coarse plaid costume for Sunday or for special occasions. In winter they wore heavy woollen dresses. At rising a detail of the girls was sent out to do the milking, and this milk, with mush cooked in large kettles, constituted the essential part of the morning meal, which the children were expected to finish in fifteen minutes. We had bread but once a week, on Saturday. I thought if I ever got out I would kill myself eating sugar and cake. We marched in military order, after breakfast, to Community House No. 2. I remember that there were blackboards covering one side of the schoolroom, and that we had wires, with balls on them, by which we learnt to count. We also had singing exercises by which we familiarized ourselves with

lessons in various branches. At dinner we generally had soup, at supper mush and milk again. We went to bed at sundown in little bunks suspended in rows by cords from the ceiling. . . . At regular intervals we used to be marched to the Community apothecary's shop, where a dose that tasted like sulphur was impartially dealt out to each pupil. Children regularly in the boarding school were not allowed to see their parents, except at rare intervals. I saw my father and mother twice in two years.

Under the articles of The New Harmony Community of Equality, the community was to be divided into six departments: (a) agriculture; (b) manufacturers; (c) literature; (d) science and education; (e) domestic economy; and (f) general economy and commerce. Each department was sub-divided into occupations. Each occupation chose an 'intendent', who in turn chose four 'superintendents'. These members, together with a secretary, formed the executive council with the real estate vested in the community as a whole. As Frank Podmore, Owen's biographer, wrote: 'Thus the Society at one step emerged from the chrysalis stage of modified individualism into the winged glory of pure communism' (Podmore, 1906).

The new constitution gave rise to dissension. A Captain Macdonald objected to the system of representative government. Indeed, the existence of intendents and superintendents in a 'community of equality' was in itself an outstanding inequality. In addition, the community was too large and there were too many differences of religion and national characteristics to achieve homogeneity.

As a result, two groups of settlers formed their own groups on the outer parts of the estate. In both cases, they were to invest their executive powers in a council of fathers, consisting of people aged at least 65 in one case and 55 in another. By March 1827, the parent community was dissolved. It was reorganized into four communities based on occupations, one of which was the Education Society, still under the direction of William Maclure. Owen warned members that, unless they joined one of the daughter communities, they must either support themselves or leave New Harmony. Many took the latter course.

The ten communities which Owen left in July 1827 did not flourish. Owen admitted on his return to the United States in April 1828 that the experiment was a failure. Addressing the New Harmony inhabitants, he said:

I tried here a new course for which I was induced to hope that fifty years of political liberty had prepared the American population – that is, to govern themselves advantageously. I supplied land, houses and the use of much capital . . . but experience proved that the attempt was premature to unite a number of strangers not previously educated for the purpose, who should carry on extensive operations for their common interest, and live together as a common family.

Owen left the community for the last time in June 1828. He had lost a large amount of money through unscrupulous speculators, and the daughter communities within a few years had ceased to exist. His four sons remained at New Harmony and became American citizens, as did William Maclure until his health

gave way. Maclure left money to establish a Working Men's Institute and a public library there.

Although as an example of practical socialism the experiment was a failure, for more than a generation New Harmony was the centre of intense social and educational interest; other communities based on similar lines were started. Owen himself had not lost faith in his venture; immediately on his return to England he proposed a similar venture in the Mexican Republic. Owen arrived in Mexico in the middle of a revolution where he obtained from the government the promise of a large extent of land for his experiment. Owen imposed the condition that an Act should first be passed granting freedom of worship, but the Mexican Congress threw this out and the proposal came to nothing.

Socialism and the final phase

Owen's vision of co-operative communities, as set out in his *A New View of Society*, and which could be established by proprietors, parishes or associations of mechanics or tradesmen, flourished in the United Kingdom. A meeting of London printers on 22 January 1821 had proposed that a 'Co-operative and Economical Society' based on Owenite principles, should be set up. It was, however, not to be 'a spade paradise' but located at Spa Fields within the City of London itself and the community lived under a strict code of moral precepts (Garnett, 1972).

A successor to the Spa Fields experiment was the London Co-operative Society which, in 1826, drew up 'Articles of Agreement for the Formation of a Community within Fifty Miles of London on Principles of Mutual Co-operation'. There would be a system of mutual instruction and self-government, women would be freed from domestic chores, and all members of the community would undertake some tasks in agriculture and in industry.

Owen was in the United States from 1824 to 1829 and was not directly involved with such initiatives, though his advocacy of community and the importance of education were the bases of many co-operative ventures. One northern correspondent wrote to Owen in 1832:

> I have to request your opinion on an undertaking that is of importance to the co-operative system – it is the wish of the Co-operative Societies of the north of England . . . to establish a school for 500 children from 4 years old to 14 years . . . and I know your experience will enable you to give us some valuable information on this subject [quoted in Silver, 1965].

There were also attempts to found socialist schools outside those of the co-operative societies. In London, at least three were founded by the mid-1830s. Owenite schools were also to be found in the industrial centres, for example in Lancashire, Cheshire, Yorkshire and Nottinghamshire (Simon, 1960).

Although Owenism, or 'Co-operation', gained ground rapidly in the 1820s, the majority of workers were unaware of these movements until the next decade.

Whilst Owen was in the United States of America, Owenite socialists such as William Thompson and William King advanced Owenism beyond the argument that co-operative communities would in themselves lead to a just society. The notion of 'co-operators' looked to a new social order based on production for use instead of profit and closely linked with trade unions. Owenism was the basis for this movement, though Owen himself was at first lukewarm. But, as unionism began to spread throughout the country in response to economic grievances, Owen's millennial ideas were embraced by co-operators and unionists. By 1833, Owen was seen as the recognized leader of the trade-union movement: in the same year, he was involved in the founding of the National Equitable Labour Exchange.

At a congress in London in October of that year, all such associations intended for the improvement of the working classes were urged to form themselves into lodges and to make their own laws and regulations in order to emancipate themselves. In the spring of the following year, the Grand National Consolidated Trades Union was formed. The union adopted Owen's views on co-operation, the formation of character, the influence of environment, the emancipation of women and, above all, the importance of education for its members, particularly children. But, by the end of the year, the Consolidated Union was no longer in existence. In March, the 'Tolpuddle Martyrs' were sentenced to seven years' transportation (banishment to Australia) for administering unlawful oaths in forming a lodge under the Consolidated Union; and the leaders of the movement were also divided on aspects of policy. The government, alarmed at the potential power of the union, imposed repression and lock-outs. Although trade unionism was not eliminated, the working-class movement turned from co-operation to Chartism, an overtly political movement, and Owen's brief leadership came to an end.

Though this was his high point of influence, Owen thereafter continued to develop his ideas but to a diminishing audience. By May 1835 he had addressed the inaugural meeting of the Association of All Classes of All Nations and followed this with *The Book of the New Moral World*, which appeared in parts between 1836 and 1844. Owen believed that a great moral revolution was at hand and that all classes should unite in order to make it successful. The book was a complete statement of his educational, moral and religious theories. Among the eighteen causes that Owen blamed for the evils of society, unequal educational opportunities was one of them. In the eight ages of man in the new Moral World, the first age, birth to 5, would give the child the type of training and education which the New Lanark Infant School had pioneered. From 5 to 10 the child would 'discard the useless toys of the old world' and instead receive his/her education by actually handling objects, by conversation with older persons and by helping with domestic duties. In the third class, from 10 to 15, adolescents would learn and practise the more advanced of the useful arts and handicrafts, and in these five years advance rapidly in knowledge of all the sciences. By the age of the sixth class, 25 to 30, all the wealth required by the

community would be being produced: as a result, work would occupy but two hours a day, the remainder of the time would be devoted to study and social intercourse.

Some of the ideas expressed in the book, such as the condemnation of marriage on the ground that it perverts and degrades a natural and lawful instinct, and equality between the sexes (Taylor, 1983) were coolly received. Even his Association of All Classes and All Nations had a patriarchal rather than a democratic structure. It was to consist of a president called the Father (Owen himself) and a series of councils based on age 'consisting of such friends as the Social Father may have been advised as the most harmonious in action and with the other' (Yeo, 1971). Owen further alienated the clerical establishment in his pamphlet *The Catechism of the Moral World*, first published in 1838, where he stated that, in the millennium, there would be no temples and no forms of ceremonies: the religion of the future was 'The Religion of Truth' (Podmore, 1906).

Between 1835 and 1845, no fewer than five Owenite communities were established in the United Kingdom. Owen's last attempt at community-making was at Queenswood, or Harmony Hall, a model village based mainly on agricultural production. Built on a grand scale with splendid buildings and equipment, it included a school for residents and for Owenites nationwide. Every member of the community also attended classes in the morning and evening. There was a range of activities including mathematics, dancing, elocution, instrumental and vocal music, grammar, geography, agriculture and botany. Owen was governor of Queenswood for three years but was turned out of office in 1844. The community closed the following year but the school continued for several years, conducted on Owenite lines.

Now aged 74, and no longer listened to by many of his disciples, Owen continued to make speeches which emphasized his belief in the supreme importance of education from birth to old age. In September 1858, Owen, already a sick man, determined to attend the meeting of the National Association for the Promotion of Social Science at Liverpool to deliver in person his last message to mankind. 'This', he wrote to a friend, 'I believe will be my last effort for the public, and I intend it to be a crowning one.' During the course of his address Owen faltered and was taken to his bed where he became unconscious. Owen died on 17 November 1858 aged 84.

Owen's beliefs in education stemmed from his lifelong protest against poverty and unhappiness. His rejection of religion as a panacea was based on his belief that man, as a rational being, was self-perfectible. The role that character formation can play in forming the good society underlay his pioneering work in establishing the New Lanark schools. He began to lose his influence over the middle classes after 1816, and this was even more obvious by the end of the New Harmony experiments. His creed was often obscure and his arguments inconsistent. As E. P. Thompson has pointed out, Owen evaded the realities of political power, believing that co-operative socialism would simply displace capitalism by example and by education (Thompson, 1968).

Nevertheless, he exercised a powerful influence through his appeal to the labouring masses and was for a brief time their leader. The co-operative society movement owed much to him. Apart from his work with labour exchanges and trade unionism, Owen, who propounded his views in no fewer than 130 works (Harrison, 1969), inspired a number of individuals who formulated a more scientific form of Owenite socialism. Owen's communities, based on co-operation and human fellowship with the school at the centre, were copied in other parts of the world. The Chartists, who turned to a more overt political approach than Owen, followed the same tradition in their educational activities, especially with reference to adult education. His influence can also be seen in some of the schools of the early progressivists in the present century.

Owen's message, that training and education must be viewed as intimately connected, is echoed in many education systems today. As Podmore (1906), in placing Owen in his historical setting, wrote:

> He saw things which were hidden from their [i.e. his contemporaries'] eyes, which are perhaps not fully discovered to ours. And when a later generation shall pronounce impartial judgment upon the men and the forces which worked for righteousness in the nineteenth century, a place will be found for Robert Owen amongst those whose dreams have helped to reshape the world.

References

Browning, M. 1971. Owen as Educator. In: S. Pollard and J. Salt (eds.), *Robert Owen: Prophet of the Poor*. London, Macmillan.

Cole, G. D. H. 1965. *The Life of Robert Owen*. 3rd ed. London, Frank Cass.

Cole, M. 1971. Owen's Mind and Methods. In: S. Pollard and J. Salt (eds.), *Robert Owen: Prophet of the Poor*. London, Macmillan.

Garnett, R. G. 1972. *Co-operation and the Owenite Socialist Communities in Britain, 1825-45*. Manchester, Manchester University Press.

Hammond, J. L.; Hammond, B. 1949. *The Town Labourer (1760-1832)*. Vol. 1. London, Longmans, Green.

Harrison, J. F. C. 1969. *Robert Owen and the Owenites in Britain and America: The Quest for the New Moral World*. London, Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Jeffreys, M. V. C. 1952. Robert Owen. In: A. V. Judges (ed.), *Pioneers of English Education*. London, Faber.

McCann, P.; Young, F. A. 1982. *Samuel Wilderspin and the Infant School Movement*. London, Croom Helm.

Owen, R. 1813/14. *A New View of Society, or Essays on the Principle of the Formation of the Human Character and the Application of the Principle to Practice*. London, Cadell & Davies.

——. 1858. *The Life of Robert Owen: Written by Himself*. Vol. 1. London, Effingham Wilson.

Owen, R. D. 1874. *Threading My Way: Twenty-seven Years of Autobiography*. London, Trubner.

Podmore, F. 1906. *Robert Owen: A Biography*. Vol. 1. London, George Allen & Unwin.

Silver, H. 1965. *The Concept of Popular Education*. London, McGibbon & Kee.

—— (ed.). 1969. *Robert Owen on Education*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Simon, B. 1960. *Studies in the History of Education, 1780-1870.* London, Lawrence & Wishart.

Smith, F. 1931. *A History of English Elementary Education, 1760-1902.* London, University of London Press.

Stewart, W. A. C.; McCann, W. P. 1967. *The Educational Innovators.* Vol. 1. *1750-1880.* London, Macmillan.

Taylor, B. 1983. *Eve and the New Jerusalem: Socialism and Feminism in the Nineteenth Century.* London, Virago Press.

Thompson, E. P. 1968. *The Making of the English Working Class.* Harmondsworth, Penguin Books.

Yeo, E. 1971. Robert Owen and Radical Culture. In: S. Pollard and J. Salt (eds.), *Robert Owen: Prophet of the Poor.* London, Macmillan.

JOHANN HEINRICH PESTALOZZI

(1746–1827)

Michel Soëtard

Pestalozzi is very often mentioned, but very rarely read and both his work and his thought are still very little known: people usually content themselves with such bland imagery as the 'the milk of human kindness' or the 'father of the poor', whereas Pestalozzi was a thinker and above all a fervent advocate of action. The father of modern educational science, he directly inspired Fröbel and Herbart and his name was associated with all the movements for educational reform that roused the passions of the nineteenth century.[1] Admittedly, however, his written work is not easy to read. Wordy, rough-hewn and written in a medley of styles and tones, it presents a permanent challenge to the Cartesian mind.[2]

To my mind, Pestalozzi's relevance today can only be determined by seeking to interpret the salient events in his life as a man and educationist in the light of today's concerns. This will help the reader rediscover the dreams and illusions that accompanied the emergence of educational thought and which still haunt it today. But, above all, it will show a man who, after the failure of a first attempt to give substance to his philanthropic dream, still found the strength for an effort to gauge the whole historic importance of the concept of education and embody it in an attitude towards teaching that was to become the be-all and end-all of his entire existence.[3]

The seminal experiment: the Neuhof

Everything hinged from the outset on an experiment that ended in disaster. Pestalozzi acquired some land in the Aargau, Switzerland, known as the Neuhof, and in the early 1770s took in poor children from the neighbourhood, setting them to work spinning and weaving cotton, the idea being that what they produced would in the long run pay for their training. For those days, it was a highly original educational enterprise, based on the children managing their own work. For Pestalozzi, it was the ultimate fulfillment of a great dream of his youth.

He began by sharing the questionings and activities of young militants agitating for a new social order. Rejecting the education system of Zurich, his native city, which, although reputed to be among the best in Europe, he considered excessively subservient to a political regime that reserved basic rights for the inhabitants of the city while leaving the rural population with none at all, the young Pestalozzi preferred to frequent student clubs where the city's real problems were freely discussed. He even came to blows with certain corrupt notables and as a result spent the last days of January 1767 in prison.

He had very close contacts with pietist circles in Zurich, in which the emphasis was on practical Christianity, far removed from merely formal religion, the constraints of dogma and concessions to political expediency. He was especially influenced by the achievements of the Anabaptists and the Moravian Brethren who here and there were conducting experiments that combined instruction with agricultural and industrial work, following in the footsteps of Francke whose orphan school at Halle had been widely acclaimed.

But it was from his compatriot Rousseau that the decisive stimulus came. *Émile* was to remain his bedside book throughout his life, and a year before his death he was still praising its author as the educational kingpin of the old world and the new, the man who had freed the mind from its chains, made the child its own creature again and restored education to children and to human nature.[4]

The impetus for the Neuhof project thus came from the great dream of recreating an independent humanity, far from the civilization of the city. Pestalozzi was to make himself a poor man among the poor, seeking to make the latter realize that their very condition contained the key to their liberation: in this instance the industrial wage, since the spread of cotton spinning and weaving in rural areas offered peasant families a stable means of subsistence such as had never been guaranteed by nature. However, they still had to learn how to make good use of this new source of well-being and, now that the link with nature had been broken, how to face up to the human implications of their emancipation. The Neuhof thus set out to achieve a dual objective: to introduce children to economic realities and at the same time to help each of them to develop their own independent personality within a free and responsible society.

Pestalozzi's experiment in teaching through work soon encountered insurmountable obstacles and had to be adjudged bankrupt in 1780. The blame is usually laid on external factors, but that is to ignore the fact that Pestalozzi himself constantly assumed the blame for his first failure, and to lose sight of an important key to his subsequent development which, in the period that included the *Inquiries*, published in 1797, the preparation of his *Theoretical and Practical Methods* and the crowning achievement of Yverdon, can be interpreted as an effort to overcome the inconsistencies that had led to the collapse of the Neuhof experiment. Indeed, most of the problems that were subsequently to bedevil the 'new education' were already to be found in that experiment, especially some of its most remarkable components, for instance those connected with industrial work.[5]

The whole undertaking was based on social work, seen as the decisive means of preventing alienation in the educational process: by financing their training with their own earnings, the children would be under no obligation to anyone. In practice, however, Pestalozzi soon realized that this philanthropic view of work had also to take into account a socio-economic environment which places such an onus of profitability on a small enterprise that its educational objectives are ultimately submerged. As for the idea that work comes naturally to man, Pestalozzi began to have second thoughts about this also when he overheard the children regretting the days when they were free to roam around the countryside.

He was banking on his boarders' interest in an experiment based on the welfare of the individual and of the group, but he rapidly had to concede that interest is always relative and firmly rooted in selfish desires. For instance, he was unable to prevent parents from turning up at any moment to take away their child, now reinvigorated, well-clad and, above all, capable of providing the family with an income that was in no danger of being diverted into another's pocket.

Pestalozzi thus found himself with his institution in an untenable position: although genuinely concerned to provide each child with the means of attaining independence, he was constantly compelled to subject these same children to the dictates of profitability, and his philanthropic homilies, touching on every chord of morality and religion, were ultimately perceived as intolerable blackmail to increase productivity. As a result, this the most generous of men, who had committed his whole fortune to the experiment, found himself accused, by those whom it was supposed to benefit, of seeking above all to serve his own self-interest.

Pestalozzi's basic objective was, as he wrote in his 1774 diary on the education of his son Jacob, 'to join together again what Rousseau had rent asunder': freedom and constraint, natural desire and the rule of law wanted by all and for all. But this same Rousseau had said that this ideal union was bound to break down at the first attempt to put it into practice.

Pestalozzi's failure bore out the paradox described in Book One of *Émile*, namely that the education of the individual (who must be free) and that of the citizen (who must be of use) can no longer be merged in a single project. Of all Rousseau's more or less devoted disciples, he at least had the merit of trying to put *Émile* into practice in all its paradoxical vigour, putting himself in a position when the time came to move beyond the fruitful contradictions of Rousseau's work.

Pestalozzi was thus obliged to look on helplessly as his experiment foundered in a sea of selfishness. However, far from giving up his basic project and docilely submitting to conventional wisdom, he made a remarkable effort, in the teeth of all opposition, to anchor this resolute desire for independence in that very social reality that had at first rejected him, a procedure that was to prompt him to take stock still more lucidly of the scope of the act of educating, of the

value of education as an activity within a society which did not know where it wanted to go.

The teacher as educator

The period between the failure of the Neuhof experiment (1780) and the new experiment in Stans (1799) is usually treated rather cavalierly by analysts of Pestalozzi's work. The fact is, however, that it saw a decisive change in his whole intellectual and practical approach, which was to bring forth from the ruins of his first experience a new type of man with a new self-awareness – the educator.

The idea gradually takes root in the experience of its proponent. It is true that the Neuhof débâcle detracted from his reputation for some time among serious practitioners, but the school that he invented in his novel *Leonard and Gertrude*, written in the 1780s and revised in the period 1790-92, was in both versions a kind of simulated experience.[6] Another experience was the dramatic fate of his son Jacob, whom he had tried in the Neuhof to make the historical personification of Émile and who after the collapse of the institute had drifted away from him, but reappeared one day in 1787, a nervous wreck and a victim of Rousseau's paradox. Other experiences were the great social upheaval of 1789, a macrocosmic replica of what he had hoped to do in the Neuhof; his being made in August 1792 an honorary citizen of the French Republic; his inability to secure a hearing for his opinions on education and his disappointment at seeing self-seeking run riot among democrats – these all provided a background for a period of intensive clarification culminating in the major theoretical treatise of 1797: *My Inquiries into the Course of Nature in the Development of Mankind*.

It is not easy to sum up in a few lines this swirling maelstrom of thoughts. Fortunately, there is an extant letter, dated 1 October 1793, from Pestalozzi to his then confidant Nicolovius, in which he briefly describes in the light of past and present events the way he is evolving.[7] He reveals that, deep down, both his thoughts and his actions have been torn in two opposite directions. First, he relates, he was the victim of an 'educational dream', based on 'economic mistakes' and deriving essentially from a grave 'error' of judgement with respect to human nature. That was precisely what went wrong at the Neuhof: a naïve faith in the miracle of industry and in man's ability to bring it spontaneously under control; a deep-seated belief in the natural freedom of the children of God and in the virtues of an education that merely seconded natural tendencies. In very interesting fashion he relates this first mistake to a second which totally absorbed him during the subsequent period. With a passionate determination to plumb the depths of the human reality that had got the better of his great idea, he set to work on a scientific approach to education. This approach is illustrated by the tables of day-to-day observations and the arithmetic of types of behaviour which he advises the tutor Petersen to use and himself directs. It may also be seen in the attitude of the schoolmaster Gluphi who, between the first and second versions

of the novel, becomes more and more concerned with getting to know men as they are and, as a practical layman, leaves it to the clergyman to bask in dreams of humanity.

These two views of man are associated with two educational projects which Pestalozzi had vainly attempted to combine in the Neuhof: achievement of the purest possible inner dignity of man and effective training for the basic needs of this life on earth.

The new departure in Pestalozzi's thought in the 1790s is his realization that these two objectives are rooted in the same illusion – claiming to be able to determine *a priori*, as though it were possible to see things through God's eyes, man's 'basic needs' in this world and the criteria defining his 'inner dignity' in the other. At a deeper level, this means claiming to delimit human freedom both in its internal dimension and in its external expression, while the autonomous development of this freedom constitutes the best prospect for education.

If there exists a type of man to be fashioned, even under the banner of freedom, education can only serve an ancillary purpose. Pestalozzi thus refuses education for reproduction of an ideal or real world: he perceives it as a form of action which allows each person to recognize his own individuality and to make a 'creative work of himself'.

Education thus finds its meaning in the project to achieve individual autonomy. But Pestalozzi makes a point of stressing that in substance this term, dear to the hearts of German idealists, amounts to something more than a new humanist concept under the cover of which human dignity would continue to be flouted. As far as the author of the *Inquiries* is concerned, autonomy is real only to the extent that it never stops being brought into being by those concerned.

A number of basic implications for Pestalozzi's thought and activities emerge from the 'master-truth' formulated in the *Inquiries*.

Politics and religion, in the throes of an endless conflict between protecting the dignity of the individual and society's inevitable encroachments on it, can only resolve that conflict through educational work. Only to the extent that legislation is practised as a form of education will statesmen succeed both in preventing social upheavals, which become ever more threatening as selfish appetites are whetted, and in giving expression to the indispensable general will that is as close as possible to the will of every individual. Religion, for its part, abandoning once and for all its claim to dominate both flesh and spirit, will revert to its role as the 'salt of the earth', an earth in which, however, to quote from the letter to Nicolovius, 'gold and stones and sand and pearls have their own value, independently of the salt'. The educationist's approach thus lessens the conflict between politics and religion, relating each to its own sphere.

At the same time, Pestalozzi was now in a position to understand the mistake he had made at the Neuhof. In trying to play two games at once, combining economic rationalism with full human development, he had placed himself, all unawares, in the centre of the storm that was raging in the society of his day. Neither a tough businessman nor a benevolent father of the people, he was from

now on to play the role of educator, aloof at once from the claims of society and from the desires of those concerned, seeking to bring the two extremes closer together by implanting in each individual a spirit of freedom in autonomy, a freedom of being involved in society through the learning of a trade and at the same time striving to achieve self-fulfilment in the process. Education thus offered a solution to Rousseau's paradox, which held that it was impossible to educate natural man and the citizen simultaneously.

In this way Pestalozzi laid the foundations for a place which was to be set apart from both the family, always preoccupied to some extent with its private interests, and civil society, invariably more concerned with the inhuman demands of economic rationalism, a place that would not only make it easier for the child to pass from one domain to another but also help to forge the freedom based on autonomy that neither nature nor law alone could guarantee. That special place was the school. The ideal, of course, would be for parents to become educators, on the same basis as the architects of the common weal; but the evolution of the family being what it is, the school, as an educational centre, must play an increasingly important role at the heart of civilized society.[8]

The school can never really accomplish this task unless it consents to educate in the full meaning of the term. According to Pestalozzi's definition, this involves applying a particular system that does not merely transmit to the young the knowledge that civilization has already accumulated, but is conceived in such a way as to make them able to build up their own freedom as autonomous beings. Neither a mere extension of the family system nor a centre for reproducing the social order, the school will create its own order through educational activity – which is the whole point of the Method.

However, the most important consequence of the process of reflection that culminated in the *Inquiries* of 1797 – a result which Pestalozzi does not specifically formulate but which underlies all his subsequent work – was that he had now taken up a position in which he could understand the way the child really develops. The Neuhof had used the child to fulfil the last adult dream – that of combining a perfect integration in society while maintaining a natural innocence. By making these ideals relative instead of absolute, Pestalozzi was able to apprehend the essential nature of the child, at the point where instinctual desire comes up against society's demand for rationality, in the very process whereby the child fashions itself through that conflict continuously experienced and continuously resolved. More than that, it is the supposedly established human social order that is destined to be regenerated through the child and through the way in which, by promoting the development of the child as a free and autonomous being, it finds itself with infinite vistas of freedom before it. 'Nature has done its work: you must now begin to do yours!'[9]

The method and its spirit

The *Inquiries* of 1797 were a call to action and the political upheavals in Switzerland in 1798 meant that the 'people's educator' once again had the benefit of a fair wind. First came the Stans experiment, launched in 1799 and swept away by the war after only a few months. It was followed by the establishment of a new institute at Burgdorf, which did not survive the fall of the Helvetian Republic in 1803. Pestalozzi was finally called to Yverdon where, on 1 January 1805, he opened an educational establishment in the château, which rapidly expanded and became famous throughout Europe. People came from all sides to observe this new educational wonder and trainee teachers arrived in waves (Prussian, French, English) to be instructed in the 'Pestalozzi Method'.

The Method is certainly the educational project that takes in all Pestalozzi's work in these three institutes. Started in practice at Stans, its basic principles were to be set out in the work *How Gertrude Teaches her Children*, published in 1801, and its various elements were constantly being further developed during the experiments at Burgdorf and Yverdon.[10]

The question of the originality of the Pestalozzi Method (Herbart's expression) is often posed. If the term is taken to refer to teaching materials and methods, a disappointment is in store: visitors to the Yverdon Institute looked in vain for the kind of 'teacher's gimmicks' that might be adopted in their own teaching practice. As far as teaching techniques are concerned, it might well be said that Pestalozzi invented nothing, not even the slate, and that he borrowed what was useful from all and sundry. It should be noted that far from being developed in an educational desert his experiment formed part of a widespread movement to fashion a new education that involved even the humblest village clergyman. Moreover, Pestalozzi himself admitted that he had been completely mistaken in some of his techniques, especially for learning languages, and he had no hesitation in introducing radical changes in a teaching method at any moment. In short, it was not in its material aspect that the originality of the Method lay.

And yet originality there was, as demonstrated by the way in which almost all practical educationists in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries were to hark back to it as to a source, and refer to it constantly in spite of all their difficulties and failures.

The originality of the Pestalozzi Method may be said to lie basically in its spirit. Its merit consists in the fact that, whereas virtually all his avowed or unavowed disciples have regularly allowed their intentions to be submerged in a body of knowledge, a technique or an *a priori* conception of man, and have just as regularly protested that what they had wanted to achieve should not be confused with what they actually had achieved, Pestalozzi himself knew that the Method and its components should never be more than mere instruments in the hands of the educator, helping him to produce something that was not present in the Method but proved quite different in nature from the Method's nuts and bolts. That 'something' was freedom with autonomy.

The Method is certainly a necessary instrument. It is important to observe the nature of children, to deduce the laws governing their development, to create an environment conducive to that development, to take expressly into account the social dimension of the educational relationship and to make a child's capacity for action effective: all these things were to be further developed and technically improved by Makarenko, Montessori, Freinet and Piaget.[11] The basic aim was to submit to unremitting scrutiny the way in which human nature functions in its various manifestations: without knowledge of that nature, no power could be exercised over it.

It is a mistake, however, to imagine that knowledge is liberating in itself: it is a necessary but not a sufficient means. The Method, with all its useful knowledge of children, can serve as an instrument of subjection as well as of liberation. To ensure that it liberates, it is necessary to devise a specific plan of action that will bring to bear the Method's techniques in such a way that they really do generate freedom in autonomy. That is where educational work really begins and where the spirit rather than the letter of the Method comes into play, a spirit in which techniques are used only to produce the contrary of a technical result. As Pestalozzi said in 1826, 'Examine everything, keep what is good and if something better has come to fruition in your own minds, add it in truth and love to what I am trying to give you in truth and love in these pages.'[12]

Obviously practice is essential and refers to an attitude; it is impossible to reduce that attitude to theoretical terms without running the risk of killing the very thing that the method and the process of applying it are supposed to bring into existence and nurture. There is a limit, continues Pestalozzi, beyond which the process must be turned on its head in order to leave the initiative to freedom and autonomy:

> Anyone who adopts the Method – child, adolescent, man or woman – will always, in practice, come to a point where very special demands will be made on his individuality: by seizing that opportunity and exploiting it, he will most certainly bring into play powers and resources that will enable him largely to dispense with the assistance and support in his education that will still be indispensable to others, and he will make himself ready to follow up and complete the remaining portion of his education, in a self-assured and independent manner. Were it otherwise, my institute would collapse, my whole enterprise would have failed.[13]

If it were necessary, however, to provide practical educationists with some idea of how the spirit of the Method was put into practice in Pestalozzi's institutes, a good beginning would be to study the way in which the three elements – heart, head and hand – form the core of the process. It is not a question here of three 'parts' of man or even of three 'faculties' but rather of three different ways of looking at this same human species in its quest for autonomy. Pestalozzi uses the word 'head' to designate man's ability to detach himself through reflection from the world and his confused impressions thereof by developing concepts and ideas. However, as individuals, human beings remain situated or even completely

immersed in a world that, through the experience they undergo, makes constant demands on their sensitivity and brings them closer to their fellows in the struggle to control nature through work: this is the domain of the heart. Acted upon, therefore, by what exists and challenged by what ought to be, people have no alternative but to use this continuous conflict which they face fair and square in order to fashion their own being: that is the work of the hand.

These three elements thus act together to bring out the drive for autonomous existence in each of the persons concerned: the part played by reason stands security for the universality of human nature; the part played by sensitivity bears witness to everyone's deep-seated individuality; while the conflict between the two releases a specifically human capacity for developing a line of conduct that will produce an autonomous personality. It should be noted, in addition, that the whole of this process evolves within the framework of society, in so far as it is society that shapes human reasoning and is also the source of the basic dissatisfaction of the individuals concerned.

The schoolteacher and, beforehand, the father and mother, provided they play the role of educators, occupy a special position with respect to the encounter between children's instinctive desires and the demands society makes on them. They have the power, during this decisive period, either to further develop the power of autonomy or to cripple it, perhaps for a lifetime. Such is the awesome moral responsibility of the educator.

A decisive factor in the exercise of this responsibility is the extent to which the educator, regardless of place and time or of the subject being taught, is able to keep these three components of the Method in equilibrium. In other words, it is not sufficient in an educational establishment to divide the subjects up harmoniously between intellectual, artistic and technical activities. Each teacher should also strive to bring into play in every educational activity all three elements involved in developing the child's capacity to act for itself: the physical education instructor will pay attention to children's intellectual grasp of the exercises they perform and to the impact on their senses; the mathematics teacher will take care not to lose sight of his subject's relevance to the children's everyday experience but to provide an opportunity for them to apply mathematics on their own account at some stage in the educational process, and so on. Pestalozzi never tires of stressing that this balance is never definitively established and may be disturbed at any moment to give undue advantage to one of the three 'animalities': head, heart or hand.

This analysis applies not only to what is required from education, such as knowledge, skills and receptivity, but also and above all to the functioning of the institutions, lying between the warmth of the family circle and the impersonal state, which is responsible for establishing self-determining freedom in a living, carefully considered and practical way. Instead of cradling children in the illusion of immediate democracy, as he had done at the Neuhof, from Stans onwards Pestalozzi set about establishing a human social order which came as close as possible to fulfilling the desires of the individual and catering to the interests of

the group, while ceaselessly striving to surpass itself in action: the children at Stans, although extremely poor themselves, took pains to make room for those even poorer.[14]

The various structures of the education system must therefore be organized in such a way as to enable the educator, in view of the task which he is called upon to fulfil, to work responsibly and autonomously in an atmosphere of freedom. Each part of the institutional machinery should serve the project that sets educational action apart from other human activities, a project intended basically for a human society coming into being against a background of autonomy within the teacher/student relationship.

The last discussion: educational theory and practice

Pestalozzi's contemporary relevance is assessed in terms of his mode of thought concerning the conflict between the school's function of integrating students into society and its duty to fashion individuals who can live in freedom: Durkheim and Illich are thus both dismissed from the suit.[15] The advocates of learning-through-living will still be able, with Pestalozzi, to take the measure of the obstacles that continue to thwart their experiments. On the other hand, those who would like to use the difficulties encountered in such previous trials as an argument in favour of restoring the old humanism surrounding the 'idea of education' will also go home empty-handed. Pestalozzi answers categorically in the negative through his relationship with the clergyman Niederer, initially his closest collaborator at Yverdon, soon afterwards his adversary and finally his sworn enemy, bent on destroying a project that refused to conform to his ideas.

The controversy that developed at Yverdon to the extent of once more disrupting the experiment is too readily ascribed to a personal quarrel and a conflict of temperaments. Actually, however, the crux of the matter lay in a fundamental issue that is still hotly debated in education: the relationship between theory and practice. If the educator, unlike the philosopher or the scientist, is, according to Hameline's definition, a practitioner in search of a practicable theory of what he is practising, Pestalozzi may be seen as the personification of that definition. At the Neuhof, he was a practitioner in the full sense of the word, out to achieve unadulterated freedom in action. The *Inquiries* of 1797 may be viewed as the culmination of a long process during which Pestalozzi worked out the theory of his educational practice, dismissing both the ineffectual wordspinning of the philosophers and the sterilizing approach of the 'science of man'.

It has been seen, however, that although the process of reflection in the *Inquiries* called for practical application, theory and practice still remained at odds. The Method set out to be a practicable theory of the educational practice developed at Stans, Burgdorf and Yverdon, and its underlying objective of individual autonomy need not seek justification outside itself. That was to be the mistake made by Niederer who, steeped in the philosophy of Fichte and Schelling

and playing Plato to the Socrates of education, set out to convert into theory the experiment taking place under his eyes. Pestalozzi, aware of the need for some such elucidation, went along with his collaborator for a time, but soon began to feel that what was emerging was more and more alien to his deepest aspirations. In the end he violently rejected Niederer's theory and his dogmatic hold on the institute.

Pestalozzi's basic objection to this theory was that by converting the Method's underlying objective of freedom into a system actually made it impracticable. In taking over the management of the institute, Niederer had indeed inspired a practical approach, but one that soon evolved at all levels in a way that threatened to defeat its own end: the attainment of freedom in one and all. In concrete terms, the teachers were more than ready to spend their time in seminars on 'liberty', 'the powers of the autonomous strength of the child' or 'the Christian approach to education', but spent less and less time on the only individuals who could give practical meaning to those fine ideas: the children present, the day-to-day realities of the institute, the small details that built up the strength in everyone to lead an autonomous life. Pestalozzi was thus faced with a general exodus of the teaching staff, and hence of the children, when it came to shouldering practical responsibilities: it is not surprising that a man who had linked education to man's moral designs, as reflected in his ability to engage in autonomous action, should have considered unbearable this distortion of his original aim and preferred to close down his institute than give in on its essential principles. Back in the peace of the Neuhof, his reflections led him to perceive a basic educational truth that became the leitmotif of his educational testament, *Swan Song*.[16]

This truth (and there should be no hesitation in calling it the 'Pestalozzi principle') may be stated as follows: the act of teaching only takes on and keeps its meaning in so far as a distinction is drawn and maintained between the general laws of development of human nature, in its three dimensions of head, heart and hand, and the way in which they are applied, especially in practical situations and the vicissitudes of daily life.

At first glance, this principle may seem disconcertingly trite: anyone who thinks at all is aware of the gap between ideas and practical realities. But to see educators straining to reconcile in their teaching activities the theory they have in their head with the sentient being in their care, to witness their crushing failures and the invariable compulsion in the end to live out their utopias on the fringes of society, is to be ultimately convinced that the author of the *Swan Song* succeeded in solving one of the basic problems of teaching: the teacher cannot hope to accomplish his task unless he can keep a distance between the two extremes of intelligence, with its tendency to generalize, and sensitivity, with its tendency to particularize, and between them both and himself. Freedom in autonomy can only really be built up in children if the teacher avoids losing himself in the airy realms of ineffectual theory or entangling himself in an intricate web of conflicting interests. This urge to draw the distinction is so strong that the *Swan Song*, which claims to bring to light the essence of elementary training, is

an invitation to every individual to assume responsibility for his actions and to have no scruples about creating, if need be, other means and other techniques, provided that he does so 'in truth and in love', that is to say, out of a desire to surround himself with other fully autonomous forces.[17]

Pestalozzi's approach is thus most deeply relevant in his so far unsurpassed reconciliation of theory and practice. And if education has a chance of developing as an active process in which practice, scientific research and theory are mutually enriching (G. Mialaret), it may be asserted that Pestalozzi succeeded in consummating this triple alliance.

Pestalozzi was therefore in a position to act on the specific nature of the child. By breaking the natural continuity between the theoretical and practical approaches to educational questions, Pestalozzi also inactivated the mechanism that had for centuries been turning the child into a docile instrument for testing the validity of preconceived ideas. By leaving a yawning gap between theory and practice, the author of the *Swan Song* released in the heart of the child the force that would enable him to fashion himself and at the same time laid the basis of scientific research specifically concerned with the art of teaching. Education is certainly a human study but it falls into a different category from the others: its dialectical relationship with practice, out of sheer respect for emerging freedom, makes it challenge the hypothesis-deduction approach adopted by the other human studies.

Pestalozzi leaves it to the teacher to experience and investigate the contradiction described at length in the *Swan Song*. The modern reader would no doubt have preferred him to pursue his thinking to a real conclusion, providing a really 'practicable theory of his practice'. His great weakness lies assuredly in the fact that he was never able to detach his work entirely from himself, his life and his experiences. However, that very weakness becomes a source of strength in the light of what had constantly been his aim from the outset: the achievement of freedom in autonomy for one and all.

Notes

1. The Centre de Documentation et de Recherche Pestalozzi, C.P. 138, 1400 Yverdon, Switzerland; the journal *Pestalozzianum* (Beckenhofstrasse 31-33, 8006 Zurich, Switzerland) regularly provides information on publications concerning Pestalozzi.
2. The only reference works available at present are the critical edition of the works and letters: *Pestalozzi, Sämtliche Werke* [Pestalozzi: Collected Works] (hereafter referred to as SW); and *Pestalozzi, Sämtliche Briefe* [Pestalozzi: Collected Letters] (hereafter referred to as SB). See 'Works by Johann Pestalozzi'. F. Buisson's *Dictionnaire* contained important articles on Pestalozzi, his experiments and his principal assistants; in 1890, J. Guillaume published his *Étude biographique de Pestalozzi* [Biographic Study of Pestalozzi] which was remarkable for its time, and Darin's translation of *Wie Gertrud ihre Kinder lehrt* [How Gertrude Teaches Her Children] was a success at the beginning of this century. The best biography of Pestalozzi in English is still K. Silber, *Pestalozzi: The Man and His Work*, New York,

Schocken, 1973. Two other useful works may be mentioned: J. Cornaz-Besson, *Qui êtes-vous, Monsieur Pestalozzi?* [Who Are You, Mr Pestalozzi?], Yverdon, 1977; and G. Piaton, *Pestalozzi*, Toulouse, Privat, 1982.

3. The following description is based essentially on the findings of the author's study: *Pestalozzi ou la naissance de l'éducateur: Étude sur l'évolution de la pensée et de l'action du pédagogue suisse (1746-1827)* [Pestalozzi or the Birth of the Educator: Study of the Evolution in the Thinking and Activities of the Swiss Educationist (1746—1827)], Bern, P. Lang, 1981, 671 pp.
4. 'Méthode théorique et pratique' [Theoretical and Practical Methods], *SW*, XXVIII, 1826, p. 319. (A text published in French by Pestalozzi.)
5. See M. M. Pistrak and P. A. Ray-Herne, *Les problèmes fondamentaux de l'école du travail* [Basic Problems of the Work School], Paris, Desclée de Brouwer, 1973.
6. A French translation of the first version is available from Éditions de la Baconnière, Boudry (Switzerland).
7. *SB*, III, pp. 292-302.
8. The association of Pestalozzi's name with the principle of family education, in particular with education by the mother, is due to an inadequate analysis of Pestalozzi's writings and the development of his thought. It is indeed equally true to say that he was fighting against the reality of the family in a state of crisis and that education and educational establishments are gradually assigned the role in his work of offsetting the inevitable break-up of the primary natural grouping: the mother is called upon, partly against her will, to become an educator.
9. *SW*, XII, p. 125.
10. The author is preparing a new French translation, with an introduction and notes, of Pestalozzi's fundamental educational work: *Comment Gertrude instruit ses enfants* [How Gertrude Teaches Her Children] and the *Lettre de Stans* [Letter from Stans]. For an overall introduction to the Method, reference may be made to the text which Pestalozzi himself published in French in 1826: 'Méthode théorique et pratique de Pestalozzi pour l'éducation et l'instruction élémentaire', *SW*, XXVIII, pp. 287-319.
11. Profiles of Freinet, Makarenko, Montessori and Piaget can be found in this series of '100 Thinkers on Education'.
12. *SW*, XXVIII, p. 57 (La Baconnière translation).
13. 'Geist und Herz in der Methode' [Spirit and Heart in the Method], *SW*, XVIII, p. 35.
14. *SW*, XIII, pp. 1-32.
15. Profiles of Durkheim and Illich appear in this series of '100 Thinkers on Education'.
16. *SW*, XXVIII, pp. 53-286 (La Baconnière translation).
17. Ibid., p. 57.

Works by Johann Pestalozzi

Pestalozzi's principal works have been published in numerous languages. The main reference works at present are the critical editions of his collected works and letters:

Pestalozzi: Sämtliche Werke [Pestalozzi: Collected Works], founded in 1927 by A. Buchenau, E. Spranger and H. Stettbacher, now being completed by E. Dejung through the work of the Forschungsstelle of the Pestalozzianum (Beckenhofstrasse

31-33, 8006 Zurich, Switzerland). Twenty-eight volumes have been published so far by W. de Gruyter (Berlin), and Orell Füssli (Zurich).

Pestalozzi: Sämtliche Briefe [Pestalozzi: Collected Letters], published by the Pestalozzianum and the Zentralbibliothek of Zurich, 1946-71. Thirteen volumes are available so far from Orell Fussli, Zurich.

Main works about Johann Pestalozzi

The bibliography of works about Pestalozzi published mainly in German has been successively assembled by:

Israel, *A. Pestalozzi-Bibliographie.* 1904. 3 vols. (Monumenta Germaniae paedagogica, 25, 29, 31)

Klinke, *W. Pestalozzi-Bibliographie.* 1923.

Klink, J.-G.; Klink, L. *Bibliographie J. H. Pestalozzi.* 1968.

Kuhlemann, G. Pestalozzi-Bibliographie 1966-1977. *Pädagogische Rundschau* (Frankfurt/Main), 1980, Nos. 2/3, pp. 189-202.

A general bibliography is being prepared at this time by the Forschungsstelle of the Pestalozzianum in Zurich. Among the books that have had a significant effect on the interpretation of Pestalozzi's work, the following can be mentioned:

Barth, H. *Pestalozzis Philosophie der Politik* [Pestalozzi's Philosophy of Politics]. 1954.

Delekat, F. *Johann Heinrich Pestalozzi, der Mensch, der Philosoph und der Erzieher* [Johann Heinrich Pestalozzi: The Man, the Philosopher and the Educator]. 3rd ed. 1968.

Froese, L., et al. *Zur Diskussion: Der politische Pestalozzi* [Subject for Discussion: The Political Pestalozzi]. 1972.

Litt, T. *Der lebendige Pestalozzi* [The Lively Pestalozzi]. 2nd ed. 1961.

Meier, U. *Pestalozzis Pädagogik der sehenden Liebe* [Pestalozzi's Pedagogy of Conscious Love]. 1987.

Natorp, P. *Der Idealismus Pestalozzis* [Pestalozzi's Idealism]. 1919.

Rang, A. *Der politische Pestalozzi* [The Political Pestalozzi]. 1967.

Schönebaum, H. *Johann Heinrich Pestalozzi. Wesen und Werk* [Johann Heinrich Pestalozzi: His Life and Work]. 1954.

Silber, K. *Pestalozzi: The Man and His Work.* New York, Schocken, 1973.

Soëtard, *M. Pestalozzi ou la naissance de l'éducateur* [Pestalozzi or the Birth of the Educator]. Bern, P. Lang, 1981. (Publications Universitaires Européennes.)

Spranger, E. *Pestalozzis Denkformen* [Pestalozzi's Manner of Thinking]. 3rd ed. 1966.

Stadler, P. *Pestalozzi.* 1988.

Stein, A. *Pestalozzi und die Kantische Philosophie* [Pestalozzi and Kant's Philosophy]. 1927.

Wernle, P. *Pestalozzi und die Religion* [Pestalozzi and Religion]. 1927.

Würzburger, K. *Der Angefochtene* [The Adversary]. 1940.

JEAN PIAGET

(1896–1980)

Alberto Munari

A portrait of an educator that is also a portrait of the great Swiss epistemologist and psychologist might, at first glance, seem surprising. Indeed, why should Jean Piaget be regarded as an educator? He never practised that profession and always refused the title of educationist, going so far as to affirm: 'I have no views on teaching' (Bringuier, 1977, p. 194), and since all his writings on education[1] do not amount to more than a three-hundredth[2] part of his *œuvre* as a whole.

Such bafflement is altogether in order if we refer only to Piaget's own scientific output. But it is less surprising if we remember the many books that we owe to other authors on the educational implications of Piaget's achievement.[3] Indeed, for several years, we have ceased to count the number of educators and educationists in different countries who explicitly refer to Piaget's work to justify their methods and principles. But is the interpretation always the same? Do writers invariably refer to Piagetian psychology, or do they evoke other aspects of his complex and many-sided work? To which of the very different Piagets do we owe the most important contributions: to Piaget the biologist, Piaget the epistemologist or Piaget the psychologist? or are we particularly indebted to the educational 'politician'? – as one might call Piaget in his capacity as Director of the International Bureau of Education.

A lifelong cause: science

Let us start, however, by filling in the background. Jean Piaget epitomizes the 'enlightened' academician who struggled all his life against the institutions and intellectual prejudices of his day – and also perhaps against his own youthful idealistic and spiritual concerns (Piaget, 1914, 1915, 1918) – in order to defend and promote the scientific approach.

Encouraged by his father, whose 'scrupulous and critical mind disliked hasty generalizations' (Piaget, 1976), he was introduced very early to the precision of naturalist observation by the malacologist Paul Godet, Director of the

Natural History Museum in Neuchâtel, his native town (Piaget, 1976, pp. 2-3). While still a schoolboy, he entered the arena of international scientific controversy by publishing as early as 1911, at the age of 15, the first of his articles in high-circulation journals. Piaget was very quickly attracted by the charm and rigour of scientific research. In his own words:

> Precocious as they were, these studies were nevertheless very useful in my scientific training. Moreover, they acted, if I may say so, like protective weapons against the demon of philosophy. Thanks to them, I had the rare privilege of catching a glimpse of science and what it represented before I went through the philosophical crises of adolescence. The early experience of these two sets of problems constituted, I am sure, the hidden inspiration for my subsequent activity in psychology (Piaget, 1976, p. 3).

Thus, in spite of two major 'adolescent crises', one religious and the other philosophical (Piaget, 1976, p. 4), Piaget was gradually brought to the firm conviction that the scientific approach was the only valid way of gaining access to knowledge, and that the introspective approaches of the philosophical tradition could, at best, help to develop a certain wisdom (Piaget, 1965*a*).

This increasingly strong conviction determined the fundamental choices that Piaget made in the 1920s or thereabouts, and which, from then on, did not waver, whether they involved the psychology he decided to study, the academic policies he chose to defend or the commitment he undertook with regard to educational issues. On the subject of psychology, he declared: 'This made me decide to devote my life to the biological explanation of knowledge' (Piaget, 1965*a*, p. 5), thereby abandoning, after an initial interest linked to his own family experiences (Piaget, 1965*a*, p. 2), psychoanalysis and pathological psychology. With regard to his work as a researcher and university teacher, the constant concern influencing and guiding his work and, indeed, his entire life was that of winning recognition, especially by his colleagues in physics and the natural sciences, for the equally scientific nature of the human sciences and, more specifically, of psychology and epistemology. His attitude and his involvement in the field of education led him quite naturally to champion the pupil's active participation as the royal road to the scientific approach in school.

The discovery of childhood and education

It was, then, this plan that motivated Jean Piaget to move away from philosophical introspection and to go to work in Paris with Janet, Piéron and Simon in the laboratories founded by Binet. It was there that he discovered for the first time the rich world of children's thinking. It was also on this occasion that he prepared the first rough draft of his critical method – which he sometimes also referred to as his clinical method – of questioning very young children, on the basis of a wholly novel and remarkable distillation of what he had just learned from Dumas and Simon in clinical psychology and from Brunschvicg and Lalande in epistemology, logic and history of the sciences.

The originality of the Piagetian exploration of a child's thought resides in the methodological principle whereby the flexibility and subtlety of the 'in-depth' interview, characteristic of the clinical approach, need to be modulated by the systematic search for the logico-mathematical processes underlying the reasoning put forward. To conduct this type of interview, however, it is necessary to refer to the various developmental stages through which the concept to be examined has passed in the course of its historical evolution. Hence, the Piagetian methodology emerges from the outset as an attempt to associate the three traditionally Western approaches that had hitherto remained separate: the empirical method of the experimental sciences; the hypothetico-deductive method of logico-mathematics; and the historical-critical method of the historical sciences (Munari, 1985*a*, 1985*b*).

In Paris, most of the children questioned by Piaget were in hospital. Only when he was called to Geneva by Edouard Claparède and Pierre Bovet did he begin to study children in their 'normal' surroundings, especially at school. The Maison des Petits of the Jean-Jacques Rousseau Institute then became the principal venue for his research. His work in this leading centre of modern education – and subsequently in the primary schools of the day in Geneva, perhaps less 'modern' than the Maison des Petits – probably helped Piaget to understand the distance which too often separated the unsuspected intellectual skills that he had just discovered in children and the teaching practices commonly adopted by teachers in state schools. Moreover, the fact that he was working this time within a Jean-Jacques Rousseau Institute entirely dedicated to developing and improving education systems and practices, and no longer in hospital establishments or medical laboratories dealing with sick or handicapped children, was bound to have a certain influence on Piaget's awareness of the wider educational issue.

'However,' Piaget admitted, not without candour, 'teaching did not interest me at the time, since I had no children of my own' (Piaget, 1976, p. 12). It was only later, when he returned to Geneva after a brief period in Neuchâtel where he had replaced his former teacher, Arnold Reymond, and was made co-director, with Claparède and Bovet of the Jean-Jacques Rousseau Institute, that his commitment to education first took tangible form. 'In 1929, I unwisely accepted the post of Director of the International Bureau of Education, yielding to the insistence of my friend Pedro Rosselló' (Piaget, 1976, p. 17). This was a decisive turning-point in Piaget's life, for it led him to the discovery of the socio-political issues that are inseparable from any educational undertaking and prompted him to embark on the grand scheme of international education.

From the IBE adventure to Piagetian educational principles

'This adventure was something of a gamble,' Piaget said, as if he wanted to play down its importance. Nevertheless, he remained at the head of this international organization from 1929 to 1968! This is, undoubtedly, a remarkable fact, not

only in itself but especially in view of Piaget's own personality, since he was notoriously reluctant to commit himself to non-scientific tasks.

Was it his desire to improve teaching methods by 'the official adoption of techniques better adapted to the mind of the child' and therefore, once again, more scientific? Or should the project be viewed as a way of becoming more effectively involved in official school institutions through the action of a supra-governmental organization? Or, again, did it hold out the hope of combating misunderstanding among peoples, and hence the evils of war, through an educational effort directed towards international values?

Every year, from 1929 to 1967, Piaget diligently drafted his 'Director's Speeches' for the IBE Council and subsequently for the International Conference on Public Education. It is in this collection of some forty documents – forgotten by most reviewers of his works – that we find features of Jean Piaget's educational credo expressed much more explicitly than in his other writings. Hence, it is those documents, rather than the few general works that Piaget agreed to publish on education (Piaget, 1969, 1972*a*), which provide illustrations of the underlying principles guiding his educational plan. We shall see that this plan is far less 'implicit' and less 'unconscious' than has often been claimed.

Above all, Piaget – contrary to what is usually thought – attached very great importance to education, for he unhesitatingly declared that 'only education is capable of saving our societies from possible collapse, whether violent, or gradual' (Piaget, 1934*d*, p. 31). In his view, the educational endeavour is therefore worth fighting for, since the outcome is sure: 'We need only remember that a great idea has its own intrinsic strength,[4] and that what exists is largely what we want,[5] in order to feel confident and to be sure that, starting from nothing, we shall succeed in giving education its rightful place internationally' (Piaget, 1934*d*, p. 31). Some years later, on the eve of the Second World War, Piaget again declared: 'After the upheavals of these last few months, education will once more constitute a decisive factor not only in rebuilding but also, and especially, in construction proper' (Piaget, 1940, p. 12). Hence, in his view, education was the prime challenge facing all peoples, transcending ideological and political divergences: 'The common wealth of all civilizations is the education of the child' (Piaget, 1940, p. 12).

But what kind of education? Here, too – and contrary to what he would later say to Bringuier (1977, p. 194) – Piaget was not afraid to enlarge on his opinions in his 'Speeches'. First, he stated a basic precept: 'Coercion is the worst of teaching methods' (Piaget, 1949*d*, p. 28). Accordingly, 'in the field of education, example must play a more important role than coercion' (Piaget, 1948, p. 22). Another precept, just as fundamental, which he put forward on several occasions, is the importance of the pupils' active participation: 'A truth learnt is only a half-truth; the whole truth is reconquered, reconstructed and rediscovered by the pupil himself/herself' (Piaget, 1950, p. 35). In Piaget's view, this educational principle rested on an indisputable psychological fact: 'All modern psychology teaches us that intelligence proceeds from action' (Piaget, 1950, p. 35),

hence the fundamental role that the exercise of research must play in all educational strategies. That research, however, must not be an abstraction, for 'action presupposes prior research, and research has value only with a view to action' (Piaget, 1951, p. 28).

A school without coercion, then, where pupils actively experiment with a view to reconstructing for themselves what is to be learnt. Here, in outline, we already have Piaget's blueprint for education. However: 'Children do not learn to experiment simply by watching the teacher performing experiments', he warns, 'or by doing exercises organized in advance; they learn by a process of trial and error, working actively and independently, that is, without restriction and with ample time at their disposal' (Piaget, 1959, p. 39). On this principle, which he considered paramount, Piaget did not fear controversy: 'In most countries, however, the school turns out linguists, grammarians, historians and mathematicians but fails to educate the inquiring mind. It is important to remember that it is much more difficult to train an experimental mind than a mathematical mind at primary and secondary school. . . . It is much easier to reason than to experiment' (Piaget, 1959, p. 39).

What, then, would be the role of books and textbooks in such a school? 'The ideal school would not have compulsory textbooks for pupils but only reference works used freely. . . . The only essential manuals are those for the teacher's use' (Piaget, 1959, p. 39).

Are these principles applicable only to children's education?

> On the contrary, active methods requiring a type of work that is both spontaneous and guided by the questions posed, and work in which the pupil rediscovers and reconstructs truths instead of receiving them ready-made, are as necessary for the adult as for the child. . . . For it should be remembered that *every time an adult tackles new problems, his or her sequence of reactions resembles the way in which reactions occur in the course of mental development* [Piaget, 1965*b*, p. 43].[6]

So these are the basic principles of Piagetian education. Nor, in his 'Speeches', did Piaget hesitate to give plenty of sound advice concerning specific disciplines, especially the teaching of mathematics:

> As small children are more developed on the sensorimotor plane than on the plane of verbal logic, it is advisable to provide them with patterns of action on which subsequent learning can be based. . . . An introduction to mathematics is [therefore] facilitated by a sensorimotor education, such as that practised, for instance, at the Maison des Petits in Geneva [Piaget, 1939*a*, p. 37].

His stance on this subject is very clear:

> Mathematical understanding is not a matter of ability in children. It is therefore erroneous to consider that lack of success in mathematics is due to a lack of ability. . . . The mathematical operation derives from action, and it therefore follows that the intuitional presen-

tation is not enough. The child itself must act, since the manual operation is necessarily a preparation for the mental one. . . . In all mathematical fields, the qualitative must precede the numerical [Piaget, 1950, pp. 79-80].

The teaching of natural sciences also received Piaget's special attention:

Those who by profession study the psychology of intellectual operations in children and adolescents are always struck by the resources at the disposal of every normal pupil, provided that he/she is given the means to work actively without the obligation of too much passive repetition. . . . From such a standpoint, science teaching is the active inculcation of objectivity and the habit of verification [Piaget, 1952, p. 33].

But the principle of active education may also be applied to less technical areas, such as the process of learning a modern language: 'learning a language as directly as possible in order to master it; then thinking about it so as to clarify the grammar' (Piaget, 1965*b*, p. 44); or it may even be applied to the development of an international outlook: 'as a means of dealing with scepticism and relational difficulties between peoples, only remedies of a receptive order have been considered, in the form of lessons, appeals to the sensitivity and imagination of the pupils. . . . We need to create social links between children, especially adolescents, and to encourage them to act and assume responsibility' (Piaget, 1948, p. 36).

With respect to the links between education and psychology, Piaget, in his 'Speeches', is much more explicit than in his other writings. Firstly, the link between education and psychology is, in his opinion, a necessary link: 'Indeed, I do not believe that there is a universal method of teaching, but what is common to all education systems is the child itself, or at least a number of general features of the child's psychology' (Piaget, 1934*b*, p. 94). And these are precisely the general features that psychology should accordingly highlight, so that educational methods can take them into account: 'It is undeniable that psychologists' research has been the starting-point of almost all methodological or didactic innovations in recent decades. It is unnecessary to reiterate that all methods appealing to a pupil's interests and actual activity have been inspired by genetic psychology' (Piaget, 1936*a*, p. 14). Nevertheless, 'the links between teaching and psychology are complex: teaching is an art, whereas psychology is a science, but while the art of educating presupposes unique innate abilities, it needs to be developed by the requisite knowledge of the human being who is to be educated' (Piaget, 1948, p. 22). Furthermore, 'it is often asserted that education is an art and not a science and therefore does not require scientific training. Although it is true that education is an art, it has the same claim to be an art as medicine which, while it requires abilities and innate gifts, also calls for knowledge of anatomy, pathology, etc. Similarly, if teaching is to train the pupil's mind, it must emanate from knowledge of the child, hence from psychology' (Piaget, 1953, p. 20). In still more specific terms, when writing about scientific research, Piaget

claims – rather argumentatively – that experimental teaching could not exist without the help of psychology:

> If experimental teaching seeks to remain a purely positivist science, i.e. confining itself to recognizing facts but not seeking to explain them, confining itself to recognizing achievements but not ascertaining the reasons for them, it goes without saying that psychology is unnecessary. . . . But if experimental teaching seeks to understand what it discovers, explain the achievements it acknowledges, and grasp the reason for the greater effectiveness of certain methods compared with others, then, of course, it is essential to combine educational research with psychological research – in other words, to make use of educational psychology constantly and not merely to measure achievements in experimental teaching [Piaget, 1966, p. 39].

But, if the links between teaching and psychology are complex, the dialogue between educators and psychologists is equally so. Piaget went so far as to offer strategic advice which, surprising as it may seem, nevertheless reflects the wisdom and experience of a skilful negotiator. He reminded us that it should always be borne in mind that 'the most elementary of psychological rules is that no human being likes being told what to do, and educators even less than all others. For a long time psychologists have been well aware that, in order to be heeded by teachers and administrators, one must be wary of appearing to have recourse to psychological doctrines and must, instead, pretend to appeal only to common sense' (Piaget, 1954*b*, p. 28).

Is this opportunism? It may seem so at first glance, but on further reflection we again find Piaget's underlying fundamental educational credo:

> We have trusted in the educational and creative value of objective exchange. We have believed that mutual information and reciprocal understanding of different angles are ways of attaining the truth. We have shunned the mirage of general truths and instead have believed in that concrete and living truth which stems from free discussion and from the laborious and tentative co-ordination of different, and sometimes opposing, points of view [Piaget, 1954*b*, p. 28].

This credo is not confined to the sphere of educational endeavours: it is, in Piaget's opinion, the *sine qua non* of all scientific work, the regulating principle of all human activity and the rule of life of every intelligent being.

The long process of genetic epistemology

It was, then, in this frame of mind that, for many years, Piaget pursued the grand plan which had fascinated him from the beginning of his career: that of being able to establish 'a kind of embryology of intelligence' (Piaget, 1976, p. 10). Thus, it was by trying various approaches and methods, and comparing scholars from various backgrounds and different specialized fields, that he studied the development of intelligence from earliest infancy. This led him to construct his famous theory of 'parallelism' between the process of constructing individual

knowledge and the process of constructing knowledge, i.e. between *Psychogénèse et histoire des sciences* [Psychogenesis and the History of Science] (Piaget and Garcia, 1983).

This theory aroused sharp controversy far beyond the frontiers of the Geneva region and the specific field of psychology. It was, however, from the heuristic standpoint, remarkably fruitful: not only did it spark off the tremendous scientific output of the International Centre for Genetic Epistemology, whose studies now run to thirty-seven volumes, but it was also at the origin of the fresh impetus given to the fundamental debate on education of Piagetian inspiration, especially in the United States.[7]

Piaget the psychologist had already supplied the educator with a substantial series of experimental data in support of the active methods which were also advocated by Montessori, Freinet, Decroly and Claparède. Through his work on the developmental stages of intelligence, he had already incited teachers to gear their teaching methods more effectively to the level of operation attained by the pupil. And now Piaget the epistemologist suggested another approach, namely, that teachers should to some extent distance themselves from the pupils, their level of attainment, their difficulties and their individual skills, with a view to becoming more broadly aware of the cultural context and taking into account the various lines of progression and historical paths of development followed by the very concepts that they were setting out to study or to teach.

In particular, the basic postulate of genetic psycho-epistemology whereby the explanation of all phenomena, whether physical, psychological or social, is to be sought in the individual's own mental development and nowhere else, helped to give the historical dimension a new role, in teaching methods as well as in general debate on education. Every theory, concept or object created by a person was once a strategy, an action, an act. From this basic postulate then emerges a new teaching precept: if to learn properly it is necessary to understand properly, then to understand properly it is essential to reconstruct for oneself not so much the concept or the object in question but rather the path that led from the initial act to that concept or object. Furthermore, this principle is applicable both to the object of knowledge and to the knower: hence the need to develop, in parallel to all learning processes, a metalanguage in which to talk about the very process of learning.[8]

The double reading of genetic constructivism

But the facts and theories of Piagetian genetic constructivism, and more especially its description of the developmental stages of intelligence and scientific knowledge, were the subject of very different readings depending on the type of conception, avowed or not, that each reader had of culture, which is undeniably the ultimate goal of any educational endeavour.

Among these various conceptions, two marked tendencies may be distinguished: one which sees culture as a sort of structure to be built gradually

according to a well-planned procedure, and the other which considers it rather to be a kind of network endowed with a certain flexibility and capacity for self-organization and whose construction or reconstruction may accordingly be prompted, facilitated, but not entirely controlled (Fabbri and Munari, 1984*a*).

The interesting fact is that both tendencies refer to Piagetian genetic constructivism, or to be precise to its theory of stages, but give two interpretations of it which are situated at different levels, one more specifically psychological and the other more strictly epistemological. These interpretations have, in the practice of teaching, ultimately become radically opposed to each other.

The first, that which places greater emphasis on the psychology of the child, considers a stage to be a degree, a precise and necessary step in the construction of the cultural edifice; it is a step determined by the very nature – almost the biological nature – of the developmental process, and is supposed to represent a stable and solid acquisition without which any subsequent construction is impossible. Typical of this position is, for instance, recourse to Piagetian 'tests' so as to give a more 'scientific' justification to educational guidance and selection procedures aimed at organizing both the education system and educational practices into a hierarchy of levels regarded as 'homogeneous' and increasingly difficult to attain.

Opposed to this first interpretation of Piagetian genetic constructivism is the second, which is more concerned with epistemological analysis. This school of thought interprets the stage rather as a sort of structuring or sudden restructuring, partially unpredictable, always temporary and unstable, of a complex network of relations which link a number of concepts and mental operations together in a continually changing pattern. A typical example of this second position – which is strongly reminiscent of Kuhn's (1962) – is the jettisoning of all rigid forms of programming and standardization in teaching practices in favour of close attention to setting up the right contexts, that is, those believed to foster the emergence of the desired patterns of organization of knowledge (Munari, 1990*d*).

Although opposed, these two positions are often found simultaneously in various areas (both literal and figurative) of the complex and heterogeneous world of education. Sometimes one or the other gains the upper hand, depending on the precise historical circumstances, local traditions, economic issues and the political forces at work.

However, the latter seems to be the one that is gaining ground today, perhaps less in conventional schooling than in non-formal education, and in particular in managerial training strategies for company executives, possibly as a result of the new challenges that a more and more interconnected and unpredictable environment imposes on the organization of human dealings.[9]

So, while Piaget the psychologist has left an undeniable stamp on educational practices, especially where early childhood education is concerned, and while Piaget the educational 'politician' has unquestionably contributed to the promotion of movements for the international co-ordination of education, Piaget

the epistemologist now influences the educational task in fields he never dreamed of. Here we have an undeniable indication of the wealth of theoretical implications and concrete suggestions that his work still offers to educators.

Notes

1. Piaget, 1925, 1928, 1930, 1931, 1932, 1933*a*, 1933*b*, 1934*a*, 1934*d*, 1935, 1936*b*, 1939*b*, 1939*c*, 1942, 1943, 1944, 1949*a*, 1949*b*, 1949*c*, 1954*a*, 1957, 1964, 1965*b*, 1966*a*, 1966*b*, 1969, 1972*a*, 1972*b*, 1973; Piaget and Duckworth, 1973. Piaget also drafted, as Director of the International Bureau of Education (IBE), some forty speeches and reports, all published courtesy of the IBE between 1930 and 1967.
2. In other words, slightly less than 1,000 pages (including speeches and reports written for the IBE) out of a total estimated at approximately 35,000 pages, not counting translations!
3. In this connection, world literature is extremely rich and it is difficult to draw up a complete list. 'Classic' reference works include Campbell and Fuller, 1977; Copeland, 1970; Duckworth, 1964; Elkind, 1976; Forman and Kuschner, 1977; Furth, 1970; Furth and Wachs, 1974; Gorman, 1972; Kamii, 1972; Kamii and De Vries, 1977; Labinowicz, 1980; Lowery, 1974; Papert, 1980; Rosskopf, Steffe and Taback, 1971; Schwebel and Raph, 1973; Sigel, 1969; Sinclair and Kamii, 1970; Sprinthall and Sprinthall, 1974; Sund, 1976; Vergnaud, 1981. We ourselves, with the help of a number of colleagues who collaborate with our group and in particular with Donata Fabbri, have on several occasions analysed the educational implications of Piaget's psycho-epistemology: Bocchi et al., 1983; Ceruti et al., 1985; Fabbri, 1984, 1985, 1987*a*, 1987*b*, 1988*a*, 1988*b*, 1989, 1990, 1991, 1992; Fabbri and Formenti, 1989, 1991; Fabbri, Mari and Valentini, 1992; Fabbri and Munari, 1983, 1984*a*, 1984*b*, 1985*a*, 1985*b*, 1988, 1989, 1991; Fabbri and Panier-Bagat, 1988; Munari, 1980, 1985*a*, 1985*b*, 1985*c*, 1987*a*, 1987*b*, 1987*c*, 1988, 1990*a*, 1990*b*, 1990*c*, 1992; Munari, Bullinger and Fluckiger, 1980.
4. This was one of Jean Piaget's fundamental convictions, already to be found in his very earliest writings: *La mission de l'idée* (Piaget, 1915).
5. A worthy constructivist act of faith!
6. We have deliberately italicized this excerpt – too often unfamiliar to those who see the Piagetian approach as relevant only to the child – for it seems to us of paramount importance from the educational standpoint. For the same reason, we have also developed, with Donata Fabbri, a strategy for an educational approach applicable to adults, which we have called 'laboratory of operative epistemology' (Fabbri, 1988*a*, 1990; Fabbri and Munari, 1984*a*, 1985*b*, 1988, 1990, 1991; Munari, 1982, 1989, 1990*a*, 1992, 1993).
7. See Copeland, 1970; Elkind, 1976; Furth, 1970; Gorman, 1972; Schwebel and Raph, 1973.
8. In this connection, and although they do not seem to have had direct links with Piagetian psychology – except of course in Geneva – the various tendencies that incline increasingly towards the use of 'educational biographies' or 'life stories' as teaching tools could be regarded as a specific development of this principle (see, for example, Dunn, 1982; Ferrarotti, 1983; Josso, 1991; Pineau and Jobert, 1989;

Sarbin, 1986). Similarly, even if its origins are elsewhere (Flavell, 1976), the rising tide of educational research and initiatives relating to metacognition can also be hailed as part of the same trend (see Noel, 1990; Weinert and Kluwe, 1987; and also Piaget, 1974*a*, 1974*b*).

9. See, for example, Fabbri, 1990; Fabbri and Munari, 1988; Landier, 1987; Munari, 1987*b*.

Works by Jean Piaget

IN CHRONOLOGICAL ORDER

1914. Bergson et Sabatier. *Revue chrétienne* (Paris), Vol. 61, No. 4, pp. 192-200.
1915. *La mission de l'idée* [The Purpose of the Idea]. Lausanne, La Concorde.
1918. *Recherche* [Research]. Lausanne, La Concorde.
1925. Un grand éducateur [A Famous Educator]. *Le nouvel essor* (Paris), Vol. 20, No. 25, pp. 1-2.
1928. Psychopédagogie et mentalité enfantine [Educational Psychology and the Child's Mentality]. *Journal de psychologie normale et pathologique* (Paris), Vol. 25, pp. 31-60.
1930. Les procédés de l'éducation morale [Methods of Moral Education]. In: *Cinquième congrès international d'éducation morale, Paris, 1930 : compte rendu et rapport général,* pp. 182-219. Paris, Alcan.
1931. Introduction psychologique à l'éducation internationale [A Psychological Introduction to International Education]. *Comment faire connaître la Société des Nations et développer l'esprit de coopération internationale: IVème cours pour le personnel enseignant: compte rendu des conférences données du 3 au 8 août 1931.* Geneva, International Bureau of Education, pp. 56-68.
1932. Les difficultés psychologiques de l'éducation internationale [Psychological Difficulties of International Education]. *Comment faire connaître la Société des Nations et développer l'esprit de coopération internationale: Vème cours pour le personnel enseignant: compte rendu des conférences données du 25 au 30 juillet 1932.* Geneva, International Bureau of Education, pp. 57-76.
1933*a*. L'évolution sociale et la pédagogie nouvelle [Social Change and New Education]. *VIème congrès mondial de la Ligue Internationale pour l'éducation nouvelle.* London, New Education Fellowship, pp. 474-84.
1933*b*. Psychologie de l'enfant et enseignement de l'histoire [Child Psychology and History Teaching]. *Bulletin trimestriel de la Conférence internationale pour l'enseignement de l'histoire* (The Hague), No. 2, pp. 8-13.
1934*a*. Discours du directeur [Speech by the Director]. In: *Troisième Conférence internationale de l'instruction publique: procès-verbaux et résolutions*, pp. 27-30. Geneva, International Bureau of Education.
1934*b*. Une éducation pour la paix est-elle possible? [Is Education for Peace Possible?] *Bulletin de l'enseignement de la Société des Nations* (Geneva), No. 1, pp. 17-23.
1934*c*. *Rapport du directeur: cinquième réunion du Conseil* [Report of the Director: Fifth Meeting of the Council]. Geneva, International Bureau of Education.
1934*d*. Remarques psychologiques sur le self-government [Psychological Remarks on Self-government]. *Le self-government à l'école*, pp. 89-108. Geneva, International Bureau of Education.

1935. Remarques psychologiques sur le travail par équipes [Psychological Remarks about Teamwork]. *Le travail par équipes à l'école*, pp. 179-96. Geneva, International Bureau of Education.

1936*a*. *Rapport du directeur à la septième réunion du Conseil* [Report by the Director for the Seventh Meeting of the Council]. Geneva, International Bureau of Education.

1936*b*. Rapport préliminaire sur l'enseignement des langues vivantes dans ses relations avec la formation de l'esprit de collaboration internationale [Preliminary Report on the Teaching of Modern Languages and Its Relationship to the Establishment of an Attitude of International Collaboration]. *Bulletin de l'Enseignement de la Société des Nations* (Geneva), No. 3, pp. 61-66.

1939*a*. Discours du directeur (et autres interventions) [Speech by the Director and Other Interventions]. *Huitième Conférence internationale de l'instruction publique: procès verbaux et recommandations*, pp. 22-23, 37, 73, 86-87, 144-45, 148-49. Geneva, International Bureau of Education.

1939*b*. Examen des méthodes nouvelles [A Look at New Methods]. *Encyclopédie française*. Tome 15: *Education et instruction*, Vol. 28, pp. 1-13. Paris, Société de Gestion de l'Encyclopédie Française.

1939*c*. Les méthodes nouvelles: leur bases psychologiques [New Methods: Psychological Foundations]. *Encyclopédie française*. Tome 15: *Education et instruction*, Vol. 26, pp. 4-16. Paris, Société de Gestion de l'Encyclopédie Française. (Also published as Piaget, 1969, pp. 197-264.)

1940. *Rapport du directeur: onzième réunion du Conseil* [Report of the Director: Eleventh Meeting of the Council]. Geneva, International Bureau of Education.

1942. Psychologie et pédagogie genevoises [Genevan Psychology and Education]. *Suisse contemporaine* (Geneva), Vol. 2, No. 5, pp. 427-31.

1943. Les tâches présentes et futures des instituts de pédagogie curative [Present and Future Tasks of the Institutes of Curative Education]. *Pro Infirmis* (Zurich), Vol. 1, No. 9, pp. 280-81.

1944. L'éducation de la liberté [Education for Liberty]. *Berner Schulblatt* (Bern), Vol. 77, No. 16, pp. 297-99.

1948. Addresses by the Director of the International Bureau of Education (and Other Interventions)]. *Eleventh International Conference on Public Education: Proceedings and Recommendations*, pp. 22-23, 28, 36, 48, 80. Geneva, International Bureau of Education.

1949*a*. *Le droit à l'éducation dans le monde actuel* [The Right to Education in the World Today]. Paris, Librairie du Recueil Sirey, 56 pp. (Also published as: Piaget, 1972*b*, pp. 41-133.)

1949*b*. La pédagogie moderne [Modern Education]. *Gazette de Lausanne et Journal suisse* (Lausanne), Vol. 152, No. 63, p. 10.

1949*c*. Remarques psychologiques sur l'enseignement élémentaire des sciences naturelles [Psychological Remarks on the Teaching of the Natural Sciences at Primary Level]. *L'initiation aux sciences naturelles à l'école primaire*, pp. 35-45. Geneva, International Bureau of Education.

1949*d*. Speech by the Director of the International Bureau of Education. *Twelfth International Conference on Public Education: Proceedings and Recommendations*, pp. 27-28. Geneva, International Bureau of Education.

1950. Speech by the Director of the International Bureau of Education. *Thirteenth International Conference on Public Education: Proceedings and Recommendations*, pp. 35-36. Geneva, International Bureau of Education.

1951. Speech by the Director of the International Bureau of Education. *Fourteenth International Conference on Public Education: Proceedings and Recommendations*, p. 28. Geneva, International Bureau of Education.

1952. Speech by the Director of the International Bureau of Education. *Fifteenth International Conference on Public Education: Proceedings and Recommendations*, pp. 31-33. Geneva, International Bureau of Education.
1953. Speech by the Director of the International Bureau of Education. *Sixteenth International Conference on Public Education: Proceedings and Recommendations*, pp. 25-26. Geneva, International Bureau of Education.
1954*a*. L'éducation artistique et la psychologie de l'enfant [Artistic Education and the Child's Psychology]. *Art et éducation: recueil d'essais*, pp. 22-23. Paris, UNESCO.
1954*b*. Speech by the Director of the International Bureau of Education. *Seventeenth International Conference on Public Education: Proceedings and Recommendations*, pp. 27-28. Geneva, International Bureau of Education.
1957. The Significance of John Amos Comenius at the Present Time. *John Amos Comenius, 1592-1670: Selections*, pp. 11-33. Paris, UNESCO. (Reprinted as *Jan Amos Comenius* in this series of '100 Thinkers on Education'.)
1960. Speech by the Director of the International Bureau of Education. *Twenty-third International Conference on Public Education: Proceedings and Recommendations*, pp. 38-39. Geneva, International Bureau of Education.
1964. Development and learning. *Piaget Rediscovered: A Report of the Conference on Cognitive Studies and Curriculum Development*, pp. 7-20. Ithaca (NY), Cornell University Press.
1965*a*. Education et instruction depuis 1935 [Education and Instruction since 1935]. *Encyclopédie française*. Tome 15: *Education et instruction*, pp. 7-49. Paris, Société nouvelle de l'Encyclopédie française.
1965*b*. Speech by the Director of the International Bureau of Education. *Twenty-seventh International Conference on Public Education: Proceedings and Recommendations*, pp. 42-44. Geneva, International Bureau of Education.
1966*a*. L'initiation aux mathématiques, les mathématiques modernes et la psychologie de l'enfant [Introduction to Mathematics: Modern Mathematics and the Psychology of the Child]. *L'enseignement mathématique* (Paris), 2nd series, Vol. 12, pp. 289-92.
1966*b*. The Psychology of Intelligence and Education. *Childhood Education* (Wheaton, Md.), Vol. 42, p. 528.
1966*c*. Speech by the Director of the International Bureau of Education. *Twenty-ninth International Conference on Public Education: Proceedings and Recommendations*, pp. 37-40. Geneva, International Bureau of Education.
1969. *Psychologie et pédagogie* [Psychology and Education]. Paris, Denoël. 264 pp.
1972*a*. *Où va l'éducation ?* [Where Is Education Going?] Paris, Denoël. 133 pp.
1972*b*. A Structural Foundation for Tomorrow's Education. *Prospects: Quarterly Review of Education* (Paris, UNESCO), Vol. 2, No. 1, pp. 12-27. (Also published in: *Education et développement*, No. 32, 1973, pp. 6-22; *Revue suisse d'éducation* (Bern), Vol. 45, No. 9, 1972, pp. 273-76 and Vol. 46, No. 2, 1973, pp. 33-36; and in Piaget, 1972*a*, pp. 5-40).
1973. Comments on Mathematical Education. *Developments in Mathematical Education: Proceedings of the Second International Congress on Mathematical Education, Exeter, 1972*, pp. 79-87. London, Cambridge University Press.
1974*a*. *La prise de conscience* [Awareness]. Paris, Presses Universitaires de France.
1974*b*. *Réussir et comprendre* [Succeed and Understand]. Paris, Presses Universitaires de France.
1976. Autobiographie [Autobiography]. In: G. Busino. (ed.), Les sciences sociales avec et après Jean Piaget [The Social Sciences with and after Jean Piaget]. *Cahiers Vilfredo Pareto. Revue européenne des sciences sociales* (Geneva), Vol. 14, Nos. 38/39, pp. 1-43.

Piaget, J.; Duckworth, E. 1973. Piaget Takes a Teacher's Look. *Learning: The Magazine for Creative Teaching* (New York), Vol. 2, No. 2, pp. 22-27.

Works about Jean Piaget

Bocchi, G., et al. 1983. *L'altro Piaget: strategie delle genesi* [The Other Piaget: Strategy for Genesis]. Milan, Emme Edizioni.

Ceruti, M., et al. 1985. *Dopo Piaget: aspetti teorici e prospettive per l'educazione* [After Piaget: Theoretical Aspects and Perspectives for Education]. Rome, Ed. Lavoro.

Bringuier, J.-C. 1977. *Conversations libres avec Jean Piaget* [Conversations with Jean Piaget]. Paris, Laffont.

Campbell, T. C.; Fuller, R. G. 1977. *A Teacher's Guide to the Learning Cycle: A Piagetian Approach to College Instruction. Multidisciplinary Piagetian-based Programs for College Freshmen.* Lincoln, Neb., University of Nebraska.

Copeland, R. 1970. *How Children Learn Mathematics: Teaching Implications of Piaget's Research.* New York, Macmillan.

Duckworth, E. 1964. Piaget Rediscovered. In: R. E. Ripple and V. N. Rockcastle, (eds.), *Piaget Rediscovered.* Ithaca, N.Y., Cornell University Press.

Dunn, J. V. 1982. *Autobiography: Towards a Poetics of Experience.* Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania Press.

Elkind, D. 1976. *Child Development and Education: A Piagetian Perspective.* New York, Oxford University Press.

Fabbri, D. 1990. *La memoria della regina: pensiero, complessità, formazione* [The Queen's Memory: Thinking, Complexity, Training]. Milan, Guerini.

——. 1991. Segni e simboli del conoscere [Signs and Symbols of Knowledge]. *Bambini* (Milan), Vol. 7, No. 8, pp. 16-21.

——. 1992. Costruttivismo come metafora [Constructivism as a Metaphor]. In: M. Ceruti (ed.), *Evoluzione e conoscenza*, pp. 433-42. Bergamo, Lubrina.

Fabbri, D.; Formenti, L. 1991. *Carte di identità. Per una psicologia culturale dell'individuo* [Identity Cards: For a Cultural Psychology of the Individual]. Milan, Franco Angeli.

Fabbri, D.; Mari, R.; Valentini, A. (eds.). 1992. *La paura di capire: modelli di socializzazione e nuove patologie nei primi anni dell'adolescenza* [The Fear of Understanding: Socialization Models and New Pathology in the First Years of Adolescence]. Milan, Franco Angeli.

Fabbri, D.; Munari, A. 1988. *La scoperta della conoscenza: simboli, strategie, contesti* [The Discovery of Knowledge: Symbols, Strategies, Contexts]. Carpi, Comune di Carpi, Quaderni di Aggiornamento del Comune di Carpi.

——. 1989. Dopo Piaget: strategie della conoscenza e implicazioni educative [After Piaget: Knowledge Strategies and Educational Implications]. (Edited by N. Bulgarelli.) *Infanzia* (Scandicci, Italy), Nos. 9/10, pp. 5-8.

——. 1990. Il pensiero in diretta [Thinking Live!]. *Oikos* (Bergamo), No. 1, pp. 225-31.

——. 1991. Cultural Psychology: A New Relationship with Knowledge. *Cultural Dynamics* (Leiden, Netherlands), Vol. 3, No. 4, pp. 327-48.

Fabbri, M. D. 1984. Obbedienza e potere [Obedience and Power]. *SE scienza-esperienza* (Milan), Vol. 2, No. 16, pp. 7-9.

——. 1985. L'obbedienza del bambino [Child Obedience]. *Studi di psicologia dell'educazione* (Rome), Vol. 4, No. 2, pp. 98-116.

——. 1987*a*. Musica e conoscenza [Music and Knowledge]. In: G. Belgrano, (ed.), *Il bambino dal suono alla musica*, pp. 36-45. Teramo, Lisciani & Giunti Ed..

——. 1987*b*. Il senso della scienza [The Meaning of Science]. *Scuola lariana* (Como), No. 13, pp. 8-10.

——. 1988*a*. Epistemologia operativa e processi di apprendimento [Operative Epistemology and the Learning Process]. In: U. Morelli, (ed.), *La formazione: modelli e metodi*, pp. 29-44. Milan, Franco Angeli Ed..

——. 1988*b*. Norme, valori e educazione [Norms, Values and Education]. *L'educatore* (Milan), Vol. 36, No. 4, pp. 55-58.

——. 1989. Psicogenesi del giudizio morale e attività agonistica [Psychogenesis of Moral Judgement and Competitive Activity]. In: A. Selvini, (ed.), *Attività mentale e movimento*. Rome, Borla Ed.

Fabbri, M. D.; Formenti, B. L. 1989. Per un approccio costruttivista neo-piagetiano dell'identità: prime riflessioni [For a Neo-Piagetian Constructivist Approach to Identity: First Reflections]. *Attualità in psicologia* (Rome), Vol. 4, No. 4, pp. 9-16.

Fabbri, M. D.; Munari, A. 1983. Per una psicologia culturale [Towards Cultural Psychology]. *Studi di psicologia dell'educazione* (Rome), Vol. 2, No. 2, pp. 16-28.

——. 1984*a*. *Strategie del sapere: verso una psicologia culturale* [A Strategy of Knowledge: towards Cultural Psychology]. Bari, Dedalo.

——. 1984*b*. Piaget anti-pedagogo? [Is Piaget against Education?] *Quaderni razionalisti* (Padua), pp. 45.

——. 1985*a*. Come il bambino vede il proprio corpo [How the Child Sees Its Own Body]. In: D. Gaburro, et al. (eds.), *Il bambino e il suo pediatra: alle soglie del futuro*. Milan, Plasmon Ed.

——. 1985*b*. Il conoscere del sapere : complessità e psicologia culturale [Awareness of Knowledge: Complexity and Cultural Psychology]. In: G. Bocchi and M. Ceruti, (eds.), *La sfida della complessità*. Milan, Feltrinelli.

Fabbri, M. D.; Panier Bagat, M. 1988. Normes et valeurs: Le concept d'obéissance chez l'enfant [Norms and Values: The Concept of Obedience among Children]. *Archives de psychologie* (Geneva), Vol. 56, No. 216, pp. 23-39.

Ferrarotti, F. 1983. *Histoire et histoire de vie* [History and Life Story]. Paris, Méridiens.

Flavell, J. H. 1976. Metacognitive Aspects of Problem Solving. In: L. B. Resnick, (ed.), *The Nature of Intelligence*. Hillsdale, N.J., Lawrence Erlbaum.

Forman, G.; Kuschner, D. 1977. *The Child's Construction of Knowledge: Piaget for Teaching Children*. Monterey, Calif., Brooks & Cole.

Furth, H. G. 1970. *Piaget for Teachers*. New York, Prentice-Hall.

Furth, H. G.; Wachs, H. 1974. *Thinking Goes to School: Piaget's Theory in Practice*. New York, Oxford University Press.

Gorman, R. 1972. *Discovering Piaget: A Guide for Teachers*. Columbus, Ohio, Merril.

Josso, C. 1991. *Cheminer vers soi* [Discovering One's Self]. Lausanne, L'Age d'Homme.

Kamii, C. 1972. An Application of Piaget's Theory to the Conceptualization of a Preschool Curriculum. In: R. K. Parker (ed.), *The Preschool in Action*. Boston, Mass., Allyn & Bacon.

Kamii, C.; De Vries, R. 1977. Piaget for Early Education. In: M. Parker and R. Parker (eds.), *The Preschool in Action: Exploring Early Childhood Programs*. Boston, Mass., Allyn & Bacon.

Kuhn, T. S. 1962. *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. Chicago, Ill., University of Chicago Press.

Labinowicz, E. 1980. *The Piaget Primer: Thinking, Learning, Teaching*. Menlo Park, Calif., Addison-Wesley.

Landier, H. 1987. *L'entreprise polycellulaire* [The Polycellular Enterprise]. Paris, ESF.

Lowery, L. 1974. *Learning about Learning: Conservation Abilities*. Berkeley, Calif., University of California Press.

Munari, A. 1980. Piaget et l'inconscient cognitif [Piaget and Unconscious Learning]. *L'éducateur* (Lausanne), Vol. 39, pp. 1179-80.

——. 1982. Per una epistemologia operativa [Towards Operative Epistemology]. In: E. Bojani (ed.), *Laboratorio Giocare con l'arte*, pp. 49-57. Faenza, Ed. Museo Internazionale delle Ceramiche.

——. 1985*a*. Per una metodologia della interdisciplinarità [Towards a Methodology of Interdisciplinarity]. *Studi di psicologia dell'educazione* (Rome), Vol. 4, No. 2, pp. 117-26.

——. 1985*b*. The Piagetian Approach to the Scientific Method: Implications for Teaching. In: V. Shulman, L. Restaino-Baumann and L. Butler (eds.), *The Future of Piagetian Theory: the Neo-Piagetians,* pp. 203-11. New York, Plenum Press.

——. 1985*c*. La creatività nell'età evolutiva : metafora e trasgressione [Creativity in the Evoluative Age: Metaphors and Transgressions]. In: C. Musatti et al. (eds.), *Psicologia e creatività*, pp. 118-25. Milan, Selezione.

——. 1987*a*. Per un approccio psico-culturale all'educazione musicale [Towards a Psycho-Cultural Approach to Musical Education]. In: G. Belgrano (ed.), *Il bambino dal suono alla musica*, pp. 46-53. Teramo, Lisciani & Giunti Ed..

——. 1987*b*. Soggetto-oggetto: Nuovi rapporti di complessità [Subject-Object: New Relationships of Complexity]. *Quaderni di Formazione Pirelli* (Milan), No. 61, pp. 55-60.

——. 1987*c*. Insegnare le scienze o la scienza? [Teaching Sciences or Science?] *Scuola lariana* (Como), No. 13, pp. 5-7.

——. 1988. Le concept d'équilibration majorante et d'homéorhèse dans la psychogénèse du sujet individuel [The Concept of Accumaltive Equilibration and of Homeorhesis in the Psychogenesis of Individual Subjects]. *Archives de psychologie* (Geneva), Vol. 56, No. 219, pp. 281-87.

——. 1989. Il pensiero del computer: l'epistemologia operativa al servizio della formazione dell'utente di sistemi informatici [Computerized Thinking: Operative Epistemology in the Service of Training the User of Information Systems]. *Sistema ER* (Bologna), Vol. 3, No. 1, pp. 26-31.

——. 1990*a*. Ricerca-azione: la scoperta della prosa [Research-Action: The Discovery of Prose]. *Il quadrante scolastico* (Trento), No. 45, pp. 25-38.

——. 1990*b*. Lo sviluppo dell'intelligenza: una equilibrazione maggiorante? [The Development of Intelligence: Accumulative Equilibration]. In: D. Barnabei et al. (eds.), *The Brain and Intelligence, Natural and Artificial*, pp. 111-19. Bologna, Ed. L'Inchiostroblu.

——. 1990*c*. Incontri: Bateson e Piaget [Meeting: Bateson and Piaget]. *Oikos* (Bergamo), No. 2, pp. 173-81.

——. 1990*d*. Emergenza e formazione [Emergence and Training]. In: G. Zanarini (ed.). *Diario di viaggio: autoorganizzazione e livelli di realtà*, pp. 9-14. Milano, Guerini.

——. 1992. Dall'epistemologia genetica all'epistemologia operativa [From Genetic Epistemology to Operative Epistemology]. In: M. Ceruti (ed.), *Evoluzione e conoscenza*, pp. 507-19. Bergamo, Lubrina.

——. 1993. *Il sapere ritrovato: conoscenza, formazione, organizzazione* [Knowledge Refound: Knowledge, Training, Organization]. Milano, Guerini.

Munari, A.; Bullinger, A.; Fluckiger, M. 1980. La ville: un objet à construire [The Town: Something to Be Constructed]. In: A. Bulhinger et al. (eds.), *Il bambino e la città*, pp. 177-83. Milano, Franco Angeli.

Noël, B. 1990. *La métacognition* [Metacognition]. Brussels, De Boeck.

Papert, S. 1980. *Mindstorms: Children, Computers, and Powerful Ideas.* New York, Basic Books.

Pineau, G.; Jobert, G. (eds.). 1989. *Les histoires de vie* [Life Stories]. Paris, L'Harmattan.

Rosskopf, M.; Steffe, L.; Taback, S. (eds.). 1971. *Piagetian Cognitive-Developmental Research and Mathematical Education.* Washington, D.C., National Council of Teachers of Mathematics.

Sarbin, T. R. (ed.). 1986. *Narrative Psychology: The Storied Nature of Human Conduct.* New York, Praeger.

Schwebel, M.; Raph, J. 1973. *Piaget in the Classroom.* New York, Basic Books.

Sigel, I. W. 1969. The Piagetian System and the World of Education. In: D. Elkind and I. Flavell (eds.), *Studies in Cognitive Development: Essays in Honour of Jean Piaget.* New York, Oxford University Press.

Sinclair, H.; Kamii, C. 1970. Some Implications of Piaget's Theory for Teaching Young Children. *School Review* (Chicago, Ill.), Vol. 78, No. 2, pp. 169-83.

Sprinthall, R.; Sprinthall, N. 1974. *Educational Psychology: A Developmental Approach.* Reading, Mass., Addison-Wesley.

Sund, R. 1976. *Piaget for Educators.* Columbus, Ohio, Charles Merril.

Vergnaud, G. 1981. *L'enfant, la mathématique et la réalité* [The Child, Mathematics and Reality]. Bern, Peter Lang.

Weinert, F. E.; Kluwe, R. H. (eds.). 1987. *Metacognition, Motivation and Understanding.* Hillsdale, N.J., Lawrence Erlbaum.

PLATO [1]

(428–348 B.C.)

Charles Hummel

Plato was born in 428 B.C., towards the end of that extraordinary period in human history when the foundations of spiritual life were being formulated by Lao-Tse (at the turn of the sixth century), Confucius[2] (551-479), Buddha (c. 550-480) and Socrates (469-399) and the Upanishads were being written (at the turn of the fifth century).

He was born to a family that belonged to the top ranks of the Athenian aristocracy. His father was a descendant of Codrus, last king of Athens. The brother of one of his mother's ancestors was Solon, the great Athenian statesman and law-maker, and one of Plato's uncles, Critias, was to become a member of the Council of Thirty. Plato was thus predestined to play an active role in Athenian politics. In his seventh *Letter* he explains why he chose not to take that path. Instead, he formulated the most significant political theory of ancient times and with it founded the science of politics.

Plato was born soon after the death of Pericles, who had been a friend of the family and who had carried Athens to the heights of its power, prosperity and culture. Sophocles and Euripides were among the great playwrights of the time who delighted the public, and the young Plato must certainly have met them.

But Plato was also destined to witness the decline of that Athens to which he was so dearly attached. As a young man he endured, probably as a soldier, the defeat of his city in the Peloponnesian War and experienced the ensuing decline of the Athenian democracy. The twilight of the Classical Age of Greece was approaching and with it the demise of the independent Greek city-states, which were supplanted by the Alexandrian empire. Plato lived in the period of transition between classical Greece and the Hellenistic era that opened a new chapter in the history of the West.

Plato's life

As a child, Plato undoubtedly received the education that was commonly given

to boys of his age. He attended a private school in Athens accompanied by a slave, or 'tutor' (there were no public schools at that time). There he studied reading, writing and arithmetic, following which he committed to memory a considerable part of the corpus of Greek poetry, above all the works of Homer, whom the Greeks considered the educator par excellence. He also learned the songs of the lyrical poets and to play the lyre, two skills that, as he put it in his *Protagoras*, 'familiarize the minds of children with the rhythms and melodies' by which 'they become more civilized, more balanced, and better adjusted' (*Protagoras*, 326b).[3] Naturally, Plato also attended the gymnasium, for physical training: for 'they are sent to a trainer, so that a good mind may have a good body to serve it, and no one be forced by physical weakness to play the coward in war . . .' (*Protagoras*, 326b-c). It may be added that Plato's sister did not go to school; she received her education, as was customary at the time, exclusively at home.

The decisive event in Plato's life was his meeting with Socrates. At the age of 20, this rich young aristocrat became the most faithful disciple of Socrates, son of a stonemason and a midwife. Plato stood by Socrates to the end, when his master was condemned to death and executed by the Athenian democracy (399 B.C.). It was a traumatic experience that marked Plato for life and reinforced his low opinion of democracy. The pages Plato wrote as Socrates's defence (*The Apology*) and on the last hours of Socrates' life are among the most moving in world literature.

After Socrates' death Plato left Athens on a long voyage that took him first to Megara, where he visited Euclid (the philosopher, not the mathematician) and then almost certainly to Egypt and Cyrene, on the coast of present-day Libya. He also travelled to Magna Graecia, in southern Italy, where he frequented Pythagorean circles, spending time notably with Archytas in Tarentum. From there he went to Sicily to the court of Dionysius I, tyrant of Syracuse, who was fond of surrounding himself with the company of famous men in order to boost his own prestige. There Plato argued his view that kings should be philosophers and should devote their lives to the service of the highest moral values rather than to their personal aggrandizement and interests, but to no avail. After twelve years of travel Plato returned to Athens, where he founded his Academy.

During his stay in Syracuse, Plato had formed a friendship with Dionysius's brother-in-law Dion, who struck him as being a potential philosopher. When Dionysius the Elder died, Dion recalled Plato to Syracuse to tutor the young Dionysius. Once again Plato thought he would be able to have his ideas on the role of education and philosophy in politics put into practice. Accordingly, he went again to Syracuse, where he was very well received, and set himself to the task of educating Dionysius II, teaching him mathematics, which he regarded as the royal road to philosophy. Plutarch, in his biography of Dion, relates how the entire court at Syracuse took up geometry, covering every room in the tyrant's castle with sawdust, upon which they drew triangles, circles and other forms. The young Dionysius, however, was not a very bright pupil and tired quickly of

the lessons of his demanding tutor. Furthermore, he was jealous of Dion, whom he sent into exile. Plato returned to Athens and founded the Academy. In 361 B.C. he succumbed for the third time to the temptation to go to Syracuse, but with no happier results: once again he encountered humiliation. It was only with the help of Archytas that he managed to get back to Athens, where in 348 B.C. he died at the age of 80.

Plato's works

The works of Plato have reached us virtually intact. They consist of twenty-eight *Dialogues* and thirteen others of variously uncertain authorship. There are also thirteen *Letters*, three of which (VI, VII and VIII) are generally recognized as having been written by Plato. Plato's *Dialogues* cover a wide range of subjects: duty, courage, virtue, justice, love, beauty, science, nature, rhetoric and the harmony of words with Being and with Ideas; the nature of humankind, wisdom, kingship, legislation, etc. With the single important exception of *Laws* – Plato's last work and the one in which he set out in detail his ideas on educational policy – Socrates is, directly or indirectly, cast as one of the protagonists of the *Dialogues*. It is the only time a disciple has ever identified himself so closely with his master as to put his own words into his master's mouth. It is extremely difficult to draw the demarcation line between the ideas of Socrates and those of Plato. Philologists have attempted to do so by sorting Plato's *Dialogues* into several groups, ranging from the more Socratic to those that clearly depart from the thought of the real Socrates and are considered to be distinctly Platonic. We cannot enter into the philological subtleties in this article and shall treat the Socrates who appears so true to life in Plato's *Dialogues* as part of the latter's 'profile'.

In fact, it is as teacher that Plato most resembles his master. Socrates appears in the works of Plato as the archetypal teacher, even though he insists that he is not one. Accordingly, the object of most, if not all, of Plato's *Dialogues* is essentially educational: his whole work was written in the service of *paideia*.

Plato was an extremely serious, moralizing and austere thinker who disapproved of the most innocent pleasures, even the reflex of laughter (*Republic*, 388e, and *Laws*, 732c). He was also a writer of exceptional literary skill, who drew his characters with a fine economy of detail in the manner of the great Chinese painters, creating in a few sentences a true-to-life atmosphere, and his works contain countless examples of superb subtlety and a flair for irony. On the other hand, his *Dialogues* contain long passages of laborious and sometimes formalistic, punctilious and, it must be admitted, frankly tiresome dialectics. Plato's writings have had a determining influence on all aspects of Western philosophy (and even perhaps on all aspects of its culture). In fact the European philosophical tradition can be characterized as a long series of dialogues with Plato or, as the great British philosopher A. N. Whitehead put it, as 'a series of footnotes to Plato'.

Plato's philosophy

In order to understand Plato and to plumb the depths of his thought we must keep closely in mind the fact that his philosophy is not in any sense a doctrine. Plato did not set up a philosophical system in the manner of Hegel, for example. The distinguishing feature of Plato's philosophy is the progression or process by which his ideas are formed – his so-called dialectical method, which does not involve solitary, hence unilateral, reflection, but is rather a collective exercise by which friends, as in the *Symposium*, or adversaries, as in *Gorgias*, move forward in argument. Moreover, Plato's *Dialogues*, which often deal with the clarification of a concept – such as beauty, duty, love, justice or pleasure – do not usually come to a final conclusion on the subject or end on universal agreement. The initial question is left open. Thus *Protagoras* concludes with the following statement, 'Well, we will talk of these matters [which we have just been discussing] at some future meeting' (*Protagoras,* 361e).

Plato sums up his approach in his seventh Letter:

> One statement at any rate I can make in regard to all who have written or who may write with a claim to knowledge of the subject to which I devote myself [philosophy] . . . Such writers can in my opinion have no real acquaintance with the subject. I certainly have composed no work in regard to it, nor shall I ever do so in future, for there is no way of putting it in words like other studies. Acquaintance with it must come rather after a long period of attendance on instruction in the subject itself and of close companionship, when, suddenly, like a blaze kindled by a leaping spark, it is generated in the soul and at once becomes self-sustaining (341b-d).

Attentive readers of Plato's *Dialogues* will find that they are participants on this sudden, vision-like dawning of knowledge. However, we must qualify this passage (which is rather discouraging for commentators on Plato!) with the observation that towards the end of the philosopher's life a touch of dogmatism crept into his work, which gives the sudden impression that one is attending an *ex cathedra* lecture by the Academy professor.

Plato was relentless in his analysis of the conditions and limitations to the acquisition of knowledge imposed by a world that was elusive because it was in constant movement. He believed that all human beings, with the exception of true philosophers, lived in a world of appearances. This is why the Socrates of his *Dialogues* incessantly demonstrates to his interlocutors how much their claims to knowledge are illusory because based on unfounded opinions or on prejudices. In *Laches*, to cite but one example, two prominent generals are obliged to admit that they do not know the meaning of courage.

On the one hand, led by his certainty of the absolute, he explored the human condition as it related to the supreme values of beauty, truth and goodness. On the other hand, haunted by his experience of the decline of Athens and convinced that all change carried within itself the seeds of corruption, he looked to permanence as the sole guarantor of absolute values. He considered that he

had discovered in the concept of 'Ideas', the incorruptible reality he regarded as the foundation of being, and he illustrated that concept by his fascinating and celebrated myth of the cave (*Republic,* 514a-517a).

It is only through a proper education and through the pursuit of philosophy that human beings can free themselves from the chains of their senses, desires, ambitions (such as wealth and power) and passions and that they can accede, progressively, passing from one level of enlightenment to the next, to true knowledge and, ultimately, to the vision of the *Agathon*, the Final Good. Plato's thought is centred on the human being and, more particularly, on the ethical problems the human being has to face. The questions of right, justice and the individual's place in society, that is in the *polis*, the Greek city-state, are among the ethical questions that concern him to the highest degree. Plato, like his pupil Aristotle after him, considered the human being a political animal.[4] He devoted two of his most important works, the *Republic* and the *Laws* to politics, of which ethics is an essential dimension.

In the course of his examination of the human being, Plato developed a new 'science' of the soul. His psychology (another discipline he fathered) may seem to the modern reader to be somewhat naïve and elementary. Nevertheless, it has some interesting features. For example, on the subject of young Charmides' headache, in the dialogue of the same name, Socrates states that 'all good and evil, whether in the body or in the whole man, originates . . . in the soul' (*Charmides,* 156e). The care of the soul is essential for a person's future. It is no accident that Socrates asks young Hippocrates, who intends to entrust his education to Protagoras the Sophist:

> Do you understand that you are going to entrust the care of your soul to a man who is, in our own words, a Sophist, though I should be surprised if you know just what a Sophist is. And yet if you don't know that, you don't know to whom you are entrusting your soul, nor whether he represents something good or bad [*Protagoras,* 312c].

Lastly, with his theses concerning the immortality of the soul, Plato also broached the area of religion.

Plato's anti-Sophism

The ideal Platonic educator or teacher is the antithesis of the Sophist. The passages in Plato's works in which Socrates criticizes or disputes with the Sophists are legion. It was, as Karl Jaspers puts it, the battle of philosophy against non-philosophy. The Sophists in Plato's time were itinerant teachers of higher education. They rented rooms and there gave lessons for an often quite substantial fee to the scions of the aristocracy, who normally completed their elementary studies in private schools at or about the age of 16. Plato himself almost certainly attended the courses of eminent Sophists such as Gorgias and Protagoras.

The Sophists taught the widest range of subjects; but they were best known as teachers of rhetoric, the art of manipulating the masses. The oratorical art,

explains Gorgias in the dialogue that bears his name, is 'The power to convince by your words the judges in court, the senators in Council, the people in the Assembly, or in any other gathering of a citizen body' (*Gorgias*, 452e). The eminent Protagoras asserts with great pride: 'From me [the student] will learn . . . the proper care of his personal affairs, so that he may best manage his own household, and also of the state's affairs, so as to become a real power in the city, both as speaker and man of action' (*Protagoras,* 319a). Plato's grand indictment of the Sophists is contained in the dialogue of the same name. His critique is presented as a sort of counterpoint to an authoritative lecture on Being, highlighting the abyss that divides true philosophy from non-philosophy. Here is the hardly complimentary portrait he draws of the Sophist: 'The hired hunter of rich young men, . . . a sort of merchant of knowledge about the soul, . . . A retail dealer in the same wares, . . . an athlete in debate, . . . a controversialist', one who instils in young people the opinion that he is, personally and in all matters, the wisest of men; he is a magician and a mimic who has appropriated the 'shadow play of words' as an art (*Sophist,* 231d, 232b, 268c).

On the other hand, 'the philosopher, whose thoughts constantly dwell upon the nature of reality, is difficult to see because his region is so bright, for the eye of the vulgar soul cannot endure to keep its gaze fixed on the divine' (*Sophist,* 254a-b).

These passages on the Sophists show that Plato demanded a deep sense of moral responsibility on the part of the true teacher, on whom lay responsibility for the sound health and fate of his pupil's soul. It was his duty to protect his disciples against false knowledge and guide them on the path to truth and virtue. He must never be a mere pedlar of materials for study and of recipes for winning disputes, nor yet for promoting a career.

Is it not a terrible historical irony that by democratic vote the citizens of Athens sentenced Socrates to death on the charge that he was, of all things, a Sophist and that he was corrupting the city's youth?

The Socratic teaching method

Socrates is presented as the archetypal educator. This is already apparent in *Laches*, which is about two eminent generals who are looking for a tutor for their sons; and Werner Jaeger, in his *Paideia*, a classical work on education in the ancient world, calls Socrates the most influential teacher in all European history.

Only Socrates asserts the contrary, as for example, in *Apology*: '[Some people are saying] that I try to educate people and charge a fee, [but] there is no truth in that either ... I think that it is a fine thing if a man is qualified to teach, as in the case of Gorgias of Leontini and Prodicos of Ceos and Hippias of Elis' (*Apology*, 19c, 19e). What is the cause of this apparent contradiction?

Socrates refuses to be taken for a teacher of the Sophist sort. He believed that in order to be qualified to teach one must know the subject taught. One must know how to make shoes before teaching another the shoemaking art, and

to be able to train a physician one must be acquainted with the various diseases and their cures. As a true philosopher, Socrates makes no claim to know anything; indeed, he is conscious of all that he does not know and, consequently, is always searching for knowledge, whereas the others – both the Sophists and the people in the street with whom he converses and whom he 'examines' – live in the illusion that they possess knowledge. In fact, exposing that illusion is the first step in the process of learning to live a good life represented as a harmonious relationship between a person and his or her final destiny, which is moral and political in nature.

In the prologue to the *Symposium* there is a delightful episode that serves as a good illustration of the Socratic method. Socrates is late in arriving because, as was occasionally his custom, he paused on the way, lost in his own thoughts (*Symposium,* 174c). Agathon, the host, invites Socrates to sit next to him because 'I want to share this great thought that's just struck you in the porch next door.' At which Socrates replies to Agathon, 'I only wish that wisdom were the kind of thing one could share by sitting next to someone – if it flowed, for instance, from the one that was full to the one that was empty, like the water in two cups finding its level through a piece of worsted' (*Symposium,* 175d). The Socratic method is to be distinguished therefore from the traditional method of teaching, in which teachers seek to transmit their knowledge to their pupils, who are expected to assimilate it on the whole passively. The Socratic method is an interactive method in which teacher and pupil co-operate in the pursuit of knowledge through dialogue. A series of questions and answers involve the two parties in the same cognitive pursuit (Plato occasionally uses images taken from the hunt). This is yet another reason – a methodological one – why Socrates does not want to be described as one who possessed knowledge.

This dialectical method runs through the entire work of Plato. The reader is drawn into the discussion as an active observer. Plato the educator takes his readers, entangled in their desires and illusions, and leads them, patiently and through a critique suffused with irony, to the point of reflection and independence.

In the *Apology*, Socrates insists that he has been entrusted with his teaching role by Apollo himself: 'God appointed me . . . to the duty of leading a philosophical life, examining myself and others' (*Apology,* 28e). As to whether he would renounce his role of 'examiner' should he be acquitted, he declares:

> Gentlemen . . . I owe a greater obedience to God than to you, and so long as I draw breath and have my faculties, I shall never stop practising philosophy and exhorting you and elucidating the truth for everyone that I meet. I shall go on saying, in my usual way, 'My very good friend, you are an Athenian and belong to a city which is the greatest and most famous in the world for its wisdom and strength. Are you not ashamed that you give your attention to acquiring as much money as possible, and similarly with reputation and honour, and give no attention or thought to truth and understanding and the perfection of your soul?' (*Apology,* 29d-e).

Accordingly, in Plato's mind, philosophy and education are one and the same discipline. The Socratic method of teaching has often been characterized as a 'maieutic' method, or one in which the teacher assumes the role of a midwife. A deciphering of this method is contained in *Meno*. There, Plato's Socrates argues that 'there is no such thing as teaching, only recollection' (*Meno,* 82a) and maintains that teachers should play the role of midwife in order to deliver their pupils of the knowledge they unconsciously possess. To illustrate this original method, Socrates conducts an educational experiment: by questioning a young slave, he leads him to self-discovery of the solution to a relatively complicated problem in geometry (*Meno,* 82b-85b). From this experiment Socrates concludes as follows:

> So a man who does not know has in himself true opinions on a subject without having knowledge . . . This knowledge will not come from teaching but from questioning. He will recover it for himself . . . And the spontaneous recovery of knowledge that is in him is recollection . . . If then there are going to exist in him, both while he is and while he is not a man, true opinions which can be aroused by questioning and turned into knowledge, may we say that his soul has been forever in a state of knowledge? Clearly he always either is or is not a man (*Meno*, 85c-d; 86a).

Maieutics is based on a concept of the immortality of the soul and of metempsychosis, which of course goes beyond the thought of the historical Socrates.

This doctrine of knowledge acquired before birth is also developed in *Phaedo* (72b et seq.), while the maieutic method described in detail, but less speculatively, in *Theaetetus* (148e-151d) is perhaps that of the historical Socrates.

The Academy

When Plato founded the Academy around 385 B.C. he was just over 40 years old. He set up his establishment on gardened premises not far from Athens. The Academy is often described as the first university in history – which is not exactly true. It resembled the medieval *universitas* more than the modern university. It was a centre of study and research, but nothing is known of the details of its organization. It was more of a scientific community than a school. The Academy was probably modelled after the Pythagorean communities Plato had visited in Magna Graecia. Legally, it was established in the form of a *thiasos*, or religious confraternity. It was dedicated to the Muses. Teachers and pupils lived there in a communal atmosphere enhanced by a dialectical method of teaching, in which doctrinal presentations were followed by discussion.

Plato remained head of the Academy for the rest of his life. This meant that for some forty years he was the driving force and principal teacher of this intellectual centre of ancient Greece. The Academy remained open until A.D. 529, that is, for almost 900 years after Plato's death.

According to an old tradition, there was an inscription over the portal of the Academy proclaiming that a knowledge of geometry was a requirement for entry. Plato probably developed a passion for mathematics during his encounters

with the Pythagoreans – especially Archytas of Tarentum, who was a brilliant mathematician. Plato, himself a seasoned mathematician, invited other scholars accomplished in this discipline to teach at the Academy. These included Eudoxas, who was a mathematician, astronomer, geographer and physician.

Science also had its place at the Academy. This fact tends to be forgotten, so firmly implanted in tradition is Plato's image as the great master of ethics and metaphysics. *Timaeus*, his great dialogue concerning Nature, testifies to the scientific work done at the Academy and the encyclopedic scope of the scientific knowledge it housed. An amusing fragment of a comedy by Epicrates has survived, in which one of the characters tells what he had heard while passing by the Academy garden: 'They were trying to define the differences between the life processes of animals and the growth of trees and vegetables. Among other matters they were trying to determine to what species pumpkins belonged.'

Politics, the main subject of the Academy, was studied and taught on a regular basis. The Academy owned a collection of the written constitutions of a large number of states. Politicians, statesmen and specialists in constitutional law were educated at the Academy; and the long list of its disciples who were called upon to act as political and legal consultants in the Greek city-states is a good indicator of the extent of its influence.

Plato's dream was to educate in his Academy those 'philosopher kings' about whom he wrote so copiously in his two works, the *Republic* and the *Statesman*, which, together with the *Laws*, contained the cream of the results of the Academy's studies and research in political science.

Philosophy, of course, took pride of place in the Academy's curriculum. The founding of the Academy opened a new period in Plato's thought. It marked his departure from the philosophical approach of Socrates. The Pythagorean doctrines began to rival the example of his former and still venerated master as his source of inspiration. This shift was already noticeable in *Meno* (as mentioned above) and in *Gorgias*, and became more pronounced right up to the *Laws*. With the exception of this last (posthumous) work, Socrates remained a central character of Plato's *Dialogues*. However, his works became more doctrinal in tone. This, it would seem, was not only a natural consequence of his daily life as a teacher at the Academy but also the sign of a conscious affirmation of his philosophical conclusions.

The educational issues with which he dealt also changed in emphasis. They had first been primarily didactic, if not methodological in emphasis, strongly inspired by the personality of Socrates – the educator – but with the Academy the emphasis became almost exclusively social and political. The focus of interest moved towards educational policy.

Educational policy in the ideal state

Plato developed his concept of educational policy in his two largest works, the *Republic* and the *Laws*. In the *Republic* Plato developed his concept of the ideal

state, which embodied justice. It was a sort of Utopia. (For Plato, however, the world of ideas, because permanent, is more 'real' than the world of facts, which is in a state of constant flux!) Rousseau believed that 'Plato's *Republic* . . . is the best treatise on education ever written' (*Émile*, Book I). In the *Laws* Plato drew up a highly detailed system of laws for a proposed colonial city-state. While the themes of these two *Dialogues* would seem to be almost identical, there are considerable differences between them. The differences, however, do not touch upon educational issues. The *Republic* is a pure theory of the ideal state, whereas the *Laws* is a practical application to a hypothetical concrete case.

In the *Republic* the inhabitants are divided into three distinct classes: slaves who are the subjects of special provisions in the *Laws*, craftsmen and merchants (generally alien without rights of citizenship) and, lastly, 'guardians', who are responsible for the security and administration of the state. The guardian class is itself divided into two groups: the 'auxiliaries' and the 'perfect' guardians, or regents – the first, in principle the youngest, having responsibility for internal and external security (including the police and the army), while the second group, the 'sages', watch over the smooth functioning and harmony of the state. At the head of the state is a 'philosopher-king' (such as Archytas of Tarentum) – an idea that is taken up again in the *Statesman* but is abandoned in the *Laws*, in which a 'nocturnal council' assumes the responsibilities of the highest authority.

The ideal society for Plato is as immutable as a Doric temple; for, in an ideal state, change can bring about only decadence and corruption (*Laws*, 797d). Society must therefore be protected from all that could upset the civic order and induce change. The guardians must devote themselves entirely to the service of the state. They may not possess material riches (which give rise to jealousy and conflict); they may not indulge in frivolities (which could compromise their integrity); nor may they entertain private ambitions. All they have must be held in common: room, board, wives and children.

One of the tasks of education in the Platonic state is to preserve the status quo. All innovation is taboo. Contrary to most modern educational principles, education must stand guard against all change and all forms of subversion.

Despite his extreme conservatism, however, Plato had some highly innovative ideas. For example, he espoused equality of the sexes at a time when women, with the exception of courtesans, were relegated to the household. In the Platonic state girls, like boys, do their gymnastics in the nude and are expected to go to war clad in the same armour as the men. They share the boys' education, with no discrimination between them. Moreover, Plato prescribes compulsory education for all, that is for all members of the guardian class. This idea, however, was not to receive application until much later, at the time of the French Revolution. Compulsory schooling goes far beyond an elementary education; yet Plato has very little to say about the education of craftsmen and merchants, which consists of no more than a simple apprenticeship, and slaves received no mention at all.

Plato, indeed, was the first to formulate a complete education system, covering every aspect – from its administration to a detailed curriculum. In the

Laws Plato describes how education should be organized and administered. The whole education system should be headed by a 'Supervisor of Education', 'far the most important of the highest offices in the state', who would supervise all aspects of education for children of both sexes. He should be 'a man of not less than 50 years, and the father of a legitimate family, preferably of both sexes' (*Laws,* 765d-e). He will have working under him 'superintendents of gymnasiums and schools in charge of their proper maintenance, as well as of the education given and the . . . supervision of attendances and accommodation for children of both sexes, together with judges of performers contending in both musical and athletic competitions' (*Laws,* 764c-d). These competitions are important because the careers of the guardians are determined by their results.

The education of the guardians – a lifelong education that stretches from before birth to retirement age – is described in detail in the *Republic* (especially Books II-V and VII) and in the *Laws* (especially Books I, II and VII). In the *Laws*, however, the programme of studies is abbreviated. Having abandoned the idea of the philosopher-king, Plato did not dwell any further on the teaching of philosophy, as he had done in the *Republic*. After introducing the concept of 'guardians', he goes on to say: 'But the rearing of these men and their education, how shall we manage that? And will the consideration of this topic advance us in any way toward discerning what is the object of our entire enquiry – the origin of justice and injustice in a State . . .?' (*Republic*, 376c-d). The object of Platonic education is therefore moral and political; it is not an apprenticeship for know-how but an education in life skills.

Since the health and beauty of both body and mind are essential goals of Platonic education (see *Laws,* 788c), education, in keeping with Greek custom, is divided into two parts: gymnastics and music (i.e. culture).

Physical education begins before birth. Pregnant women are advised to walk around and move about as much as possible, for 'every sort of shaking and stirring [communicates] health and beauty, to say nothing of robustness' to the unborn infant (*Laws,* 789d).

Preschool education is the responsibility of parents (whereas in the *Republic* infants are raised collectively and do not know who their parents are!), who are enjoined to treat infants with measured discipline, for 'while spoiling of children makes their tempers fretful, peevish and easily upset by mere trifles, the contrary treatment, the severe and unqualified tyranny which makes its victims spiritless, servile and sullen, renders them unfit for the intercourse of domestic and civic life' (*Laws,* 791c).

The teaching of culture begins very early on, through the stories parents tell their children. Plato attaches the greatest importance to the content of these stories, for first impressions shape the still malleable minds of children and determine their character. Consequently, such stories must pass the censors' scrutiny. Plato places a strong and oft-repeated stress on censorship, not sparing even Homer.

Next to stories, games should contribute to the education of children. 'He who is to be good at anything as a man must practise that thing from early childhood, in play as well as in earnest. . . . Thus, if a boy is to be a good . . . builder, he should play . . . at building toy houses' (*Laws,* 643b). From the ages of 3 to 6 children should play together under the supervision of women assigned to that task.

Children enter school at the age of 6. They first learn to read, write and count. 'For reading and writing three years or so, from the age of 10, are a fair allowance of a boy's time, and if the handling of the lyre is begun at 13, the three following years are long enough to spend on it. No boy, no parent shall be permitted to extend or curtail this period from fondness or distaste for the subjects' (*Laws,* 809e-810a).

Together with this literary and musical education, students of the Platonic state engage in all sorts of sports, including horse-riding and weapons training. The balance between culture and gymnastics should be maintained as perfectly as possible (*Republic,* 411c et seq.).

At the age of 18, at the end of this basic education period during which they will have undergone many contests and examinations of all sorts, young people – both boys and girls – are required to devote themselves exclusively for a period of two to three years to physical and military training, as the traditional *ephebe* did.

At the age of 21 pupils selected on the basis of their past performance go on to higher studies. It is here that Plato's curriculum differs fundamentally from the tradition of employing Sophists for the purpose. It is this level of studies, which leads to philosophy and, at the same time, to the highest offices in the state, that concerned Plato the most. In fact, they formed the subject of the teaching at his Academy. Education, then, was compulsory until the age of 20. Plato recommended that 'all this study . . . must be presented . . . not in the form of compulsory instruction . . . because . . . a free soul ought not to pursue any study slavishly'. Moreover, 'nothing that is learned under compulsion stays with the mind' (*Republic,* 536d-e).

These higher studies, which stretch over a period of ten years, consist of a systematic assemblage and arrangement of the knowledge acquired in past studies: 'They will be required to gather the studies which they disconnectedly pursued as children in their former education into a comprehensive survey of their affinities with one another and with the nature of things' (*Republic,* 537c). This is essential for an understanding of dialectics, 'for he who can view things in their connection is a dialectician' (*Republic,* 537c). It is probably also at this stage that the *Laws* would be studied as a manual of politics, social sciences and comparative law (*Laws,* 811c-d).

Special stress is next placed on the study of the four disciplines that prepare the student for philosophy: arithmetic, geometry, astronomy and harmony. These disciplines lift the soul to the level of the immutable. Mathematics – arithmetic and geometry – liberate the mind from sensation, familiarize it with the world of

pure thought and turn the soul towards the heights of the world of ideas. 'Geometry is the knowledge of the eternally existent' (*Republic,* 527b). It is through geometry that one learns how to manipulate concepts (*Republic,* 510-11). Astronomy initiates the soul to the order and immutable harmony of the cosmos. Harmony, a sister science of astronomy, focuses on the search for and knowledge of the laws of, and the order in, the world of sound. The influence of the Pythagoreans here is obvious. Plato repeated with insistence that we must 'prevent our fosterlings from attempting to learn anything that does not conduce to the end we have in view' (*Republic,* 530e).

At the age of 30 – and not before – Plato's students finally begin to study philosophy or dialectics. After pursuing this course for five years they must then 'return once again to the cave' and serve for fifteen years in the army and the civil service, where they are constantly put to the test. 'At the age of 50 those who have . . . approved [sic] themselves altogether the best in every task and form of knowledge' will be able to behold the good; 'and when they have thus beheld the good itself they shall use it as a pattern for the right ordering of the state' (*Republic,* 540a). They will then devote the rest of their lives alternately to philosophy and public life.

When they retire, these state officials will have the leisure time to devote themselves entirely to the delights of philosophy – this being their sole reward.

Plato's *polis* is essentially an educational community. It is created by education. It can survive only on condition that all its citizens receive an education that enables them to make rational political decisions. It is up to education to preserve the state intact and to defend it against all harmful innovations. The aim of education is not personal growth but service of the state, which is the guarantor of the happiness of its citizens for as long as they allow it to be the embodiment of justice.

Notes

1. This text was first published in *Prospects*, Vol. 22, No. 4, 1992.
2. A profile of Confucius appears in this series of '100 Thinkers on Education'.
3. Quotations are from The *Collected Dialogues of Plato*, edited by E. Hamilton and H. Cairns, Princeton, N.J., Princeton University Press, 1973. The line numbers, as is customary, are those established by the Stephanus edition (1578).
4. A profile of Aristotle appears in this series of '100 Thinkers on Education'.

Select bibliography

Blattner, F. *Geschichte der Pädagogik* [History of Education]. Heidelberg, Quelle & Meyer, 1968.

Brun, J. L'Académie [The Academy]. *Encyclopédie de la Pléiade, Histoire de la philosophie*, Vol. 1. Paris, Gallimard, 1969.

——. *Platon et l'Académie* [Plato and the Academy]. 10th ed. Paris, Presses Universitaires de France, 1991. (Que sais-je series.)

Castle, E. B. *Ancient Education and Today*. 2nd ed. Harmondsworth, U.K., Penguin Books, 1962.

Cross, R. C.; Woozley, A. D. *Plato's Republic. A Philosophical Commentary*. London, Macmillan, 1991.

Ferber, R. *Platos Idee des Guten* [Plato's Idea of Goodness]. Sankt Augustin, Academia Verlag Richarz, 1989.

Gauss, H. *Handkommentar zu den Dialogen Platos* [Commentary to Plato's Dialogues] Bern, Herbert Lang, 1952-67. 7 vols.

Gigon, O. *Sokrates* [Socrates]. Bern, A. Francke, 1979.

Grube, G. M. A. *Plato's Republic*. Indianapolis, Hackett, 1986.

Guillermit, L. *Platon par lui-même* [Plato by Himself]. Combas, Éditions de l'Éclat, 1989.

Jaeger, W. *Paideia. Die Formung des griechischen Menschen* [Paideia: The Making of Greek Manhood]. 4th ed. Berlin, Walter de Gruyter, 1959. 3 vols.

Jeannière, A. *Lire Platon* [Reading Plato]. Aubier, 1990.

Marcuse, L. *Plato und Dionys*. Berlin, Blanvalet, 1968.

Marrou, H.-I. *Histoire de l'éducation dans l'antiquité* [History of Education in Antiquity]. 7th ed. Paris, Seuil, 1976.

Nietzsche, F. *Introduction à la lecture des Dialogues de Platon* [Introduction to the Reading of Plato's Dialogues]. Combas, Éditions de l'Éclat, 1991.

Picht, G. *Platons Dialoge 'Nomoi' und 'Symposion'* [Plato's Dialogue 'Laws' and 'Symposium']. Stuttgart, Klett-Cotta, 1990.

Pietri, C. Les origines de la 'pédagogie'. Grèce et Rome [The Origins of 'Pedagogy': Greece and Rome]. *Histoire mondiale de l'éducation*, Vol. I. Paris, Presses Universitaires de France, 1981.

Plato. *Sämtliche Werke* [Collected Works]. (With an introduction by Olof Gigon; trans. by R. Rufener.) Zurich, Artemis, 1974.

Popper, K. R. *The Open Society and its Enemies*. Vol. I: *Plato*. 5th ed. London, Routledge, 1991.

Ruggiero, G. De. *La Filosofía Greca* [Greek Philosophy]. 6th ed. Bari, Laterza, 1946. 2 vols.

Vlastos, G. *Socrates*. Cambridge, University Press, 1991.

Wahl, J. Platon [Plato]. *Encyclopédie de la Pléiade, Histoire de la philosophie*, Vol. 1. Paris, Gallimard, 1969.

Wyller, E. A. *Der späte Platon* [The Latter-day Plato]. Hamburg, Felix Meiner, 1970.

JOSEPH PRIESTLEY

(1733–1804)[1]

Ruth Watts

Joseph Priestley, now probably best known as the discoverer of oxygen, was in his own lifetime as famous, or infamous, as a radical political and religious leader. At the same time, he was a great educator, using his practical experiences of teaching to support the many educational treatises he produced. His influence on English education was deep, being immediately effective in radical, educational circles, particularly those associated with the Unitarian religious movement, and thence disseminated into the educational changes of the nineteenth century.

Priestley lived at a time when England was dominated by an established order of aristocracy, landed gentry and Church, but a massive social, economic, intellectual and cultural change was taking place. The aristocracy, great landowners holding leading positions in royal circles and in the Church of England, had an unshakeable grip on political power and, with the gentry, ran local government. The middle ranks in society, however, including both merchant princes rich from tobacco and slave-trading, and new industrialists making fortunes in coal, iron and cotton, were growing in size and confidence. The beginnings of industrialization and urbanization were creating new tensions and groupings in society (Porter, 1990).

Such tensions were reflected in religion where those people who refused to conform to the established Church – the Church of England – were condemned as dissenters or nonconformists. The most radical of these were the 'rational dissenters', including the Unitarians. The latter were a small group, but they attracted many leading industrialists and progressive intellectuals. Like other 'enlightened' thinkers, Unitarians agreed that humanity and its environment was best understood by reason, experience and experiment, but they fused religion with philosophy and science, supremely confident that science was a way of understanding the rationality of God's creation and that only good could result from open, free inquiry. Tolerant and optimistic, they sought a new, just moral order in society. They supported the American Revolution and enthusiastically welcomed the outbreak of the French Revolution. Many were involved in the

struggle to reform the English constitution by widening political power and participation and particularly by repealing those Acts of Parliament that militated against dissenters. Foremost in all this was Joseph Priestley.

Life and educational activities

Priestley was born and educated in Yorkshire, but from 1752 until 1755 he attended Daventry Academy, one of those 'dissenting' academies which offered some of the best higher education of the day. England's traditional education system, in contrast, had many drawbacks in the second half of the eighteenth century. The two universities, Oxford and Cambridge, from whose degrees dissenters were excluded, had become rather ossified and self-contained, reflecting in their traditional studies and comparative inactivity both their clerical dominance and their increasing reliance on the governing classes. Both the public and grammar schools, which together provided traditional, classical education for boys from social classes above the poor, were generally at a low ebb and suffering from competition with private schools offering either classics or a more modern curriculum, possibly including mathematical and vocational subjects. Schools and private education for middle-class girls were even worse, giving little but an elementary education or a superficial grounding in showy accomplishments designed to catch a husband. There was little schooling for the poor, the few charity and private schools being increasingly insufficient at a time when the population was rapidly expanding.

In this educational milieu it was the dissenters who tended to offer the best education, certainly at the higher level. Their leading academies had a curriculum more modern than that of the universities and led students to examine all sides of every issue. Joseph Priestley both took his own stimulus from such teaching and, in turn, helped to expand the curriculum of the most liberal of them, thus developing an outstanding education which foreshadowed developments in the university education of the future. His ideas were also influential in schooling generally. He himself ran a school for both boys and girls from 1755 to 1761. He successfully introduced lessons in both practical science and modern history. For the latter, he began preparing the much published *Chart of Biography*, which in 1766 contributed to his election as a Fellow of the Royal Society. His concern to help his pupils write plain English correctly and fluently led him to publish for them in 1761 his *Rudiments of English Grammar*, which he later enlarged and was in print for half a century. So successful was he as a teacher that in 1761 he was invited to become tutor in languages and *belles lettres* at the young Warrington Academy, the flagship of dissenting education.

At Warrington, Priestley's wide-ranging lectures, particularly on history and law, furthered a great broadening of the curriculum in an already innovative institution. He included so much in his courses that when he left they had to be divided between three men. He also lectured on chemistry and, for one year, on anatomy, established a small library and, at a time when there was a dearth of

suitable textbooks in all subjects, continued a lifelong series of educational works, many of which were based on his own lectures.[2]

At the same time, Priestley became increasingly interested in experimental philosophy in which he was largely self-taught and in which, from his Warrington days, he established an international reputation. His *Introduction to Electricity for Beginners* (written in response to strong demand in 1768) was quickly to go through two editions. No wonder that Priestley was seen as the most brilliant of the superb staff at Warrington in its most progressive period or, as Jeremy Bentham said: 'Warrington was then classic ground. Priestley lived there' (Gibbs, 1965, p. 34).

From 1765 to 1780 Priestley was in turn a dissenting minister at a chapel in the city of Leeds and literary companion to the Earl of Shelburne. By the time he became co-pastor of the New Meeting in Birmingham in 1780 he was the leading figure in English pneumatic chemistry, a formidable adversary in religious debate and a fluent publicist of educational reform. He also became the foremost protagonist in the struggle for civil and religious liberties until reaction to the French Revolution resulted in his becoming one of the most hated radicals of the day and drove him first from Birmingham in 1791 and thence to the United States of America, after four years in London where he had delivered gratis, at the New College, Hackney, his Warrington lectures on history and chemistry. His educational activities continued to the last, his final educational publication being *Hints Concerning Public Education,* written for Thomas Jefferson's proposed new public institution of higher learning in Virginia.

Educational philosophy and psychology

In education, therefore, Priestley was as much involved with the practice as with theory, and this influenced his educational writings. But he was also deeply interested in rationalist philosophy, particularly that concerning the working of the human mind. Like most dissenting educationists of the eighteenth century, he admired John Locke, but even more than this he absorbed David Hartley's *Observations on Man* which he reissued in condensed form and developed to become the cornerstone of Unitarian educational thought in the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries.

Priestley welcomed Hartley's attempt to use Newtonian techniques to formulate a few basic wide-reaching laws to establish a clear theory of the mind. Hartley had developed a full associationist psychology, based on current physiological knowledge and maintaining that all complex or 'intellectual' ideas arise from simple ones, which, in turn, 'arise from the impressions made by external objects upon the several parts of our bodies'. These sensations, he said, when often repeated, give rise to ideas and any series of sensations. If associated with each other sufficiently, they have 'such a power over the corresponding ideas . . . that any one of the sensations when impressed alone, shall be able to excite in the mind the ideas of the rest' (Hartley, 1976, Vol. 1, p. 65).

From this, Hartley argued that associationism was the basis of man's mental, emotional and moral life, a line of argument eagerly seized upon by Priestley who stated that 'nothing is requisite to make any man whatever he is, but a sentient principle . . . and the influence of such circumstances as he has actually been exposed to' (Priestley, 1790*a*, p. 184).

Priestley welcomed the analysis of complex ideas whereby 'our external senses furnish the materials of all the ideas of which we are ever possessed' and wholeheartedly agreed that, therefore, since not all associations were good ones, development must not be left to chance – 'we [must] learn to cherish and improve good ones, check and root out such as are mischievious and immoral' (Priestley, 1790*a*, p. 189; Hartley, 1976, Vol. 1, p. 81). Rather than reliance on innate character or divine intervention, tremendous importance was given to environment and circumstance in the belief that 'children may be formed or moulded as we please' (Priestley, 1782, p. 521; Hartley, 1976, Vol. 1, p. 82; Vol. 2, p. 453). Through association, intellectual, physical and moral development were seen by Priestley as interdependent. Thus real virtue for him was 'the result of reflection, or discipline and much voluntary exertion'; making good choices and judgements depended on extensive intellectual education, 'a large stock of ideas and much experience'; a sound intellectual and moral development depended on a healthy body although 'muscular habits' were not conducive to sensibility of mind (Priestley, 1794, p. 389; Priestley, 1775, p. 21; Priestley, 1970, pp. 122-23). The law of association, indeed, was the basis of education and life, a systematic means of achieving moral, religious and intellectual objectives and even perfection (Priestley, 1782, p. 515).

Who should be educated?

The implications of Priestley's educational philosophy seemed to be that all people should receive the same careful, wide education, and that parents and teachers especially should both fully understand the law of association and be well educated themselves. Thus Priestley advocated a far higher level of education for females than was usual. Firstly, since development depended completely on education, women were not, as many people assumed, inferior in mental capacity. Secondly, since women had the same moral duties and passions as men and since morality and virtue were improved by intellectual culture, women had as much right to the latter as men. Thirdly, women needed to be well educated to be respected wives and good mothers. Women who were well educated intellectually and morally would be well fitted to educate and influence others and to obtain an independent living if need be (Priestley, 1790*b*, p. 419; Priestley, 1780, pp. 171, 137-38).

Similarly, the logical extension of Priestley's principles ought to have been that people of all classes in society should receive the same education. Despite the fact, however, that contemporaries saw him as the arch-leveller and regularly burnt him in effigy (Lincoln, 1971, p. 179), Priestley was ambivalent about the

education of the poor. He was concerned about their welfare and desirous of their literacy, but his deep fear of state control over education and thus of uniformity of thought and belief, instead of variety and freedom, prevented him from advocating a national system. His educational writings were directed towards the middle classes and for others he held the reservations typical of his class and period (Priestley, 1771, pp. 43-47).

The curriculum and methods

The law of association also implied what should be learned and how. For Priestley 'the most effectual discipline of the mind' was experience, and thus a reliance on empirical knowledge favoured those subjects whose content or methods were based on experience and inductive reasoning. In the human sciences, history was the outstanding example of these. As Priestley said, history was 'anticipated experience'; perhaps not as striking as personal experience but more correct and complete. It enabled students to understand change, cause and effect, to improve their judgement and understanding, lose their prejudices, learn from the past how to improve affairs in the future and appreciate the wide variety of human nature (Priestley, 1803, pp. 25 et seq.). Until this time, however, history in formal education had always been 'ancient' history, so Priestley's introduction of modern history as an academic discipline at Warrington was a revolutionary innovation.

In the same way, Priestley, the leading British chemist of the day, delighted not only in contemporary discoveries in the physical sciences, but also in their methods of study. He rejoiced that scientific knowledge was increasing and, since this meant that 'the security and happiness of mankind are daily improved', pleasure could be taken in these studies through association. The study of science, like that of history, seemed to prove that divine providence was 'gradually conducting things to a more perfect and glorious state' (Priestley, 1767, pp. 341-42, 345). No wonder, therefore, that at Hackney Priestley developed further the scientific teaching which he had encouraged at Warrington, teaching especially 'the whole of what is called Chemistry' (Priestley, 1794, p. 385).

As a Unitarian minister, Priestley tried to advance radical attempts to study the beginnings of Christianity in a historical context and to promote the idea of progressive revelation. He established Sunday classes for young, middle-class 'rational dissenters' of both sexes, writing appropriate materials for them in his optimistic hope that simple, undogmatic religious teaching would prove satisfying, and that freedom of inquiry alone could develop and augment the nation's wisdom. Such a principle, which was upheld only by the liberal dissenting academies in higher education at the time, was as passionately denounced by others as it was passionately upheld by Priestley (Priestley, 1791*b*, pp. 458-74; Priestley, 1791*a*, pp. 420-40).

Priestley realized that, to avoid forming false biases or misleading impressions through association, ideas and language should be kept clear. In his

Warrington lectures on *The Theory of Language and Unversal Grammar* he stated how important it was to understand the nature of language – 'the means of preserving and bringing into perfection all other arts; . . . the measure of our intellectual powers . . .; the greatest distinguishing mark of a civilised being' (Priestley, 1762, p. 125). Against the fact that English was still not taught as a subject in its own right in public and grammar schools, Priestley wrote and illustrated his own *Rudiments of English Grammar*. He used English rather than the customary Latin terms and filled the work both with profuse, clear examples of the language, drawn from modern popular literature and normal speech, and with extracts from the best English authors and poets (Priestley, 1798, pp. 3-118).

To assist the inculcation of clear knowledge, Priestley urged teachers to illustrate and exemplify their ideas and to welcome students' questions and observations (Priestley, 1777, pp. 259; Priestley, 1780, p. 219). Similarly, he stressed the vital importance of systematic methods and this was why he carefully classified and related the periods and different aspects of history in his own *Chart of History* and *Chart of Biography*. He was keen on visual aids, such as models, and any ways that would help students to understand the full significance of their work. Thus, in history he spent much time discussing both the multifarious kinds of sources that historians use and the works of different historians through the ages. In science he insisted on experiment as the key to understanding and clear thinking, and he emphasized that all studies should be adapted to the age and capacity of the learner (Priestley, 1803, pp. 54-202, 463-83; Priestley, 1769, p. 10).

Priestley most clearly exemplified the law of association in his Warrington lectures, published in 1777 as *A Course of Lectures on Oratory and Criticism*. With ample illustrations from the English and ancient classics, Priestley proved how the use of associationism was the basis of good speaking, writing and, indeed, teaching, and thus influenced the formation of imagination, taste and all intellectual pleasures (Priestley, 1777, pp. 257-482).

Education for a new order

In his dedication to his *Course of Lectures*, Priestley vigorously declared that his was an age in which public distinctions based on mere force, superstition or accident would no longer stand unless they were made 'truly respectable and useful' by 'good principles and good dispositions, joined to a cultivated understanding' (Priestley, 1777, p. 255). His educational philosophy, in fact, was strongly influenced by his perception of the needs of the rising industrial and commercial middle class, in which many dissenters, including the energetic Unitarians, were to be found. Convinced that it was an era of dramatic change for humanity, of 'new light . . . bursting out in favour of the civil rights of men', he exhorted the students of Hackney College to help obtain:

> the flourishing state of science, arts, manufactures and commerce; the extinction of wars . . ., the abolishing of all useless distinctions. . . . In short to make government as beneficial . . . as possible. Let the Liberal Youth be everywhere encouraged to study the nature of government and attend to everything that makes nations secure and happy [Priestley, 1791*a*, p. 434].

This was why Priestley included in the study of history not only every aspect of civil government including law, but also the principles of commerce and taxation, subjects then generally dismissed as 'illiberal' because trade and commerce, from the point of view of the ruling classes, were seen as activities of the lower orders in society. Priestley, however, lived and worked among those who were revolutionizing England into the first industrial nation. An active participant in the scientific and industrial concerns of the small but vital Lunar Society of Birmingham, which included in its membership James Watt, Matthew Boulton and Josiah Wedgwood, he was certain that the leaders of the future would come from those who mastered the sources of knowledge which were changing the world (Schofield, 1963; Priestley, 1803, pp. 5, 22, 313-17, 403-15, 471-75). The very scientific and industrial interests that were scorned in traditional education were to him the just basis of a prosperous meritocracy. In contrast to widespread traditional views, he upheld science rather than the arts as having the liberalizing and humanizing role in education. He accepted that 'the arts . . . promote society and humanity, which are so favourable to the progress of science', but believed that science was where human understanding reached its apogee, 'grasping at the noblest objects' and thus enabling mastery of the powers of nature, an increase in the well-being of mankind and thence a golden age (Priestley, 1803, p. 311; Priestley, 1767, p. 345).

For Priestley, literary and scientific excellence accompanied by a proper moral development were necessary in a 'truly liberal education'. He considered that England needed to modernize higher education if it was to develop its full potential. This was why he upgraded the teaching of modern languages, particularly the vernacular (though he recognized the uses of the ancient languages, especially for intending ministers) and why he made his reforms at Warrington. He wanted those who would fill 'the principal stations of active life' and might well influence politics to understand the history and laws of their country and 'be well instructed in the great and leading principles of wise policy' (Priestley, 1794, p. 389; Priestley, 1791*a*, pp. 420-21; Priestley, 1780, pp. 185-228). In similar vein, he stimulated elocution lessons and recognized the importance of travel abroad, although his usual open-mindedness baulked a little at the thought of possible unwelcome influences from foreign morals and religion! (Priestley, 1970, pp. 88-89; Priestley, 1780, pp. 146-48).

What Priestley was ardently desiring was the education of enlightened leaders of the middle class whose culture and status they would raise. He did not admire the hereditary aristocracy and condemned their 'public' schools as immoral and their universities as repressive (Priestley, 1780, pp. 50-52, 111-19).

He upheld middle-class dissenting academies as more liberal and enlightened, open to all, less expensive, teaching liberal principles in both religion and politics, and resembling 'rivers, which taking their natural course, fertilize a whole country'. In contrast he depicted the universities as 'pools of stagnant water, . . . offensive to the neighbourhood' and inculcating 'slavish and illiberal' principles (Priestley, 1787, p. 128; Priestley, 1791*a*, p. 425).

Priestley anticipated that only the rudiments of any subject would be taught, formal education being only a preparation for lifelong development and application (Priestley, 1794, p. 385). He had little appreciation of the aesthetic and fine arts, but he did want to promote those arts and sciences that would benefit mankind and give the middle class a proper status within the community, for 'in fact it is knowledge that finally governs mankind, and power, though ever so refactory, must at length yield to it' (Priestley, 1791*a*, pp. 439, 431).

Priestley's influence on education

Thus it can be seen that Priestley advocated a liberal and useful education, based on the principles and methods of Hartleian psychology, which would serve the interests both of rational religion and of the new industrial and commercial classes. In formal education, he was an exciting and innovative force in both the subjects and the methods he emphasized. He wrote prolifically on all these: many of his books went into several editions and thus his ideas were popularized at least among progressive educationists. He made difficult subjects understandable and the sources of knowledge more accessible, as in his promotion of the libraries of Leeds and Birmingham. He was not without critics, though even these, like Hazlitt, might admire his range, diversity and clarity (Hazlitt, 1904, pp. 357-59).

Priestley was successful in stimulating interest in Hartley's works. His most immediate impact was on the Unitarians themselves whose subsequent wide involvement in educational ventures of all kinds thus disseminated his ideas (Watts, 1986). Well-known English educationists of their day, such as Dr John Aikin, Anna Barbauld, Lant Carpenter, Mary Carpenter and Harriet Martineau, all exemplify this (Aikin, 1823, 1825; L. Carpenter, 1820; R. L. Carpenter, 1842, p. 497; Martineau, 1877, Vol. 1, p. 104). Such Unitarians as these and others developed Priestley's views on the curriculum. His work in promoting education in the vernacular and English prose and poetry was eagerly taken up, for example, by William Enfield and thus spearheaded a growing movement for the serious teaching of English (Enfield, 1808). Unitarian educationists enthusiastically included modern history in their teaching of and writings for children and persisted in their acceptance of it as a legitimate subject in higher education. They also promoted geography in schools but more significant was their involvement in science, particularly through their prolific writings for readers of all ages and through their membership and founding of scientific societies, where they achieved an influence out of all proportion to their numbers (Watts, 1986).

That Unitarians were so affected by Priestley might not seem so important since they comprised a very small group in society and were unpopular because of their radical religious and political views, even before extreme reaction to the French Revolution and those who supported it turned particularly on them. The very academies they lauded, Warrington and Hackney, both failed in turn. Their emphasis on intellect rather than imagination was to make them unfashionable in some quarters in the days of the Romantic Movement. They did, however, have a disproportionate impact on education as they did in local politics and the industrial world, and thus disseminated Priestley's ideas. Through their prominence in scientific societies and their writings, including their large contribution to the growing corpus of children's literature and educational books (often one and the same), they captured a wide audience for their ideas.

Furthermore, Unitarians ran prestigious schools to which many of liberal persuasion, not necessarily those belonging to the Unitarian Movement, sent their children, both boys and girls. The schools of Thomas Wright Hill, an ardent disciple of Priestley, and his sons, for example, attracted wide public interest. The Hills' system of education has been termed an 'educational refraction of Priestley's ideas' by Armytage, who has marked the chain leading from M. D. Hill through his grandson, a science master at Eton who inspired Julian Huxley, the first Director-General of UNESCO and proponent of a philosophy of 'world scientific humanism' (Armytage, 1967-68). Typically, both Manchester College (Watts, 1986) and schools run by Unitarians offered a wide classical, modern and scientific curriculum and produced many eminent men and women who, thereafter, through their involvement in many of the educational ventures of the nineteenth century, spread further the ideas which they had imbibed. Not least was this shown in the excellent education that Unitarians gave to their daughters and thence the role models which women, such as Harriet Martineau, Elizabeth Gaskell, Mary Carpenter and Florence Nightingale, provided for others. Many Unitarians led the way in nineteenth-century battles for women's rights (Watts, 1989).

It would be foolish to say that Priestley was the only educational influence on the Unitarians or that they, in turn, were the only radical educational reformers of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. It is true, however, that they were heavily involved in all manner of educational initiatives, that their principal impetus for many years came from Priestley and that he himself worked with other radical educationists of the day such as those in the Lunar Society (Schofield, 1963).

Many of Priestley's ideals were not completely or even partially realized. His unpopularity and that of Unitarianism partly militated against absorption of his ideas. The Unitarians, always small in number, usually had to work in collaboration with others and this often diluted their objectives, or at least concealed their contribution. It is difficult to gauge how far Unitarians influenced the very gradual adoption of English literature, modern languages, modern history and geography in the grammar and public schools and the ancient universities after

1850, but they certainly had promoted these subjects since the time of Priestley. Very importantly they had continued both to foster the study of science and to attract to their ranks eminent scientists, including applied scientists and engineers who were creating industrial England. Unfortunately, however, outside the institutions with which Unitarians and other progressive educationalists were connected, science did not become, as Priestley had hoped, an integral part of the curriculum at the time, with the result that the lack of status of science and technology in British education has been a serious drawback for an industrial nation.

Priestley did achieve success in another important ideal, however. His striving to have free inquiry in education and to have open access to all educational institutions was a fight taken up with alacrity by Unitarians of the nineteenth century, such as James Heywood who was foremost in the successful campaigns both to open up the universities of Oxford and Cambridge to non-Anglicans and to admit women to London University. Priestley, indeed, though over-optimistic in his assumptions of what could be achieved in education in the eighteenth century, forecast many of the changes that have gradually occurred (as well as some of the problems, for example of central power dominating education) and through his own work, further disseminated by his followers, had an incalculable influence on English education.

Notes

1. Much of this profile is drawn from the unpublished Ph.D thesis: Watts, R.E. *The Unitarian Contribution to Education in England from the Late Eighteenth Century to 1853*. University of Leicester, 1987.
2. Priestley's writings, many of which had several editions, were reprinted in *The Theological and Miscellaneous Works of Joseph Priestley*. (Ed. by J. T. Rutt.) London, 1817-31. 25 vols.

Works by Joseph Priestley

IN CHRONOLOGICAL ORDER

1762. A Course of Lectures on the Theory of Language and Universal Grammar. *The Theological and Miscellaneous Works of Joseph Priestley* Vol. 23. (Ed. by J. T. Rutt.) London, 1817-31. (Hereafter referred to as *Works*.)
1767. The History and Present State of Electricity, with Original Experiments. *Works*, Vol. 25.
1769. *A Familiar Introduction to the Study of Electricity*. London, Johnson & Payne.
1771. An Essay on the First Principles of Government. *Works*, Vol. 22.
1775. An Examination of Dr Reid's Inquiry into the Human Mind . . . *Works*, Vol. 3.
1777. A Course of Lectures on Oratory and Criticism. *Works*, Vol. 23.
1780. Miscellaneous Observations relating to Education; An Essay on a course of Liberal Education for Civil and Active Life; . . . Lectures on the Study of History; . . . Lectures on the Laws of England. *Works*, Vol. 25.
1782. The Doctrine of Philosophic Necessity Illustrated. *Works*, Vol. 3.

1782. The Doctrine of Philosophic Necessity Illustrated. *Works*, Vol. 3.
1787. A Letter to the Right Honorable William Pitt . . . *Works*, Vol. 19.
1790*a*. Introductory Essays to Hartley's Theory of the Human Mind. *Works*, Vol. 3.
1790*b*. Reflections on Death . . . *Works*, Vol. 15.
1791*a*. The Proper Objects of Education in the Present State of the World. *Works*, Vol. 15.
1791*b*. A Particular Attention to the Instruction of the Young Recommended in a Discourse Delivered at the Gravel-Pit Meeting, in Hackney . . . *Works*, Vol. 15.
1794. Preface and Dedication to Heads of Lectures on a Course of Experimental Philosophy. *Works*, Vol. 25.
1798. The Rudiments of English Grammar. *Works*, Vol. 23.
1803. Lectures on History and General Policy (Philadelphia, 1803). *Works*, Vol. 24.
1970. *Autobiography of Joseph Priestley.* (Ed. by J. Lindsay.) Bath, United Kingdom, Adams & Dart.

Works about Joseph Priestley

Aikin, L. 1823. *Memoir of John Aikin M.D.* London, Baldwin, Cradock & Joy. 2 vols.
——. (ed.). 1825. *The Works of Anna Laetitia Barbauld.* London, Longman, Hurst, Rees, Orme, Brown & Green. 2 vols.
Armytage, W. H. G. 1967-68. 'The Lunar Society and its Contributions to Education.' *University of Birmingham Historical Journal* (Birmingham, United Kingdom), Vol. 5, pp. 65-78.
Carpenter, L. 1820. *Principles of Education.* London, Longman, Hurst, Rees, Orme & Brown.
Carpenter, R. L. 1842. *Memoir of the Rev. Lant Carpenter LL.D.* London, Green.
Enfield, W. 1808. *The Speaker.* London, Joseph Johnson.
Gibbs, F. W. 1965. *Joseph Priestley: Adventurer in Science and Champion of Truth.* London, Nelson.
Hartley, D. 1976. *Observations on Man.* New York, Delmar.
Hazlitt, W. 1904. The Late Dr Priestley. *The Collected Works of Joseph Priestley.* Vol. 12. (Ed. by A. R. Waller and A. Glover.), pp. 357-60. London, Dent.
Lincoln, A. 1971. *Some Political and Social Ideas of English Dissent, 1763-1800.* New York, Octagon Books, 1971.
Martineau, H. 1877. *Autobiography.* Vol. 1. London, Smith, Elder & Co.
Porter, R. 1990. *English Society in the Eighteenth Century.* Harmondsworth, United Kingdom, Penguin Books.
Schofield, R. E. 1963. *The Lunar Society of Birmingham: a Social History of Provincial Science and Industry in Eighteenth Century England.* Oxford, United Kingdom, Oxford University Press.
Watts, R. E. 1986. Manchester College and Education 1786-1853. In: B. Smith (ed.). *Truth, Liberty and Religion,* pp. 79-110. Oxford, United Kingdom, Manchester College.
——. 1989. 'Knowledge Is Power — Unitarians, Gender and Education in the Eighteenth and Early Nineteenth Centuries.' *Gender and Education* (Abingdon, United Kingdom, Carfax), Vol. 1, No. 1, pp. 35-50.

ISMA'IL AL-QABBĀNĪ

(1898–1963)

Mahmud Kombar

Isma'il al-Qabbānī was born in a village in Asyut, Upper Egypt, in 1898. He was born twenty-five years after the death of al-Tahtāwī (d. 1873), who had been a pioneer in the renaissance of Arab culture and was the first Egyptian to advocate modernization of Arab thought and education.[1] Al-Qabbānī also was born five years after the death of 'Alī Mubārak (d. 1893), the Minister of Education who had reformed the education system, giving it a sound modern foundation.[2] During his childhood and as a young man, al-Qabbānī was in contact with such renowned figures in the educational world as Sheikh Muhammad 'Abduh (d. 1905) and Sheikh Muhammad Rashīd Ridā (d. 1935).[3] He examined the programmes of political parties whose opposing ideologies varied between the far right and the far left, including a range of tendencies from conservative Islamic fundamentalism, conciliatory or innovative Islam, moderate liberalism, Arab nationalism, radical secularism to revolutionary socialism. All of these parties had placed education as one of the primary concerns in their national programmes,[4] especially since the British colonial authorities in Egypt had in 1882 decreed the policy of withholding funds from education, fearing that its spread would raise aspirations among the Egyptians and encourage them to launch a campaign for liberation.[5]

These political parties had their own means of publicity which served to increase press circulation: in 1948 there were 353 newspapers and magazines, official and private, published in Arabic. There were also 102 newspapers and magazines published in foreign languages.[6] Most of them gave regular space to articles and sections dealing with educational thought, philosophy, organization, planning and practice.[7]

In his student days, al-Qabbānī came into contact with contemporaries studying in foreign schools, and came to know about the varied educational goals and functions of these systems. While located in Egypt, they represented their own Western milieu, spreading new cultural values, lifestyles and ways of thinking – the subject of considerable debate among local politicians and intellectuals.[8]

Al-Qabbānī was also acquainted with the work and ideas of the great foreign educationists living and working in Egypt. There was the Swiss Dor Bey, who established the system of educational inspection, and the Armenian Jacob Artin who, as under-secretary at the Ministry of Education, had developed the education system shortly before the British occupation of Egypt.

Al-Qabbānī worked with a number of foreign professors who visited Egypt to study educational problems and who suggested ways of modernizing the system. These included the E. Claparède[9] of the Jean-Jacques Rousseau Institute in Geneva, and the British inspector of education F. O. Mann. They spent a whole year (1929) in Egypt, and presented two separate reports. There was also the British specialist in elementary education, Marvin, who came to Egypt in 1931.

From these specialists, and from others, Al-Qabbānī learned a great deal, but he had ideas of his own which made him a unique educational pioneer.

The 'John Dewey' of Egypt

Egyptian thinkers and innovators at the time of the national renaissance were aware of the crisis in education; they shared in the spirit of reform and the will to modernize. However, they were influenced by a variety of philosophies: Rousseau's romantic naturalism, Kant's idealism, Conte's positivism, Locke's empiricism, Spencer's rationalism and Darwin's evolutionism. The most important books dealing with these philosophies and their educational consequences were translated into Arabic.[10]

Reformers writing on educational theories criticized education systems or suggested that they should be modernized. For the most part, they were not themselves specialists in education, but rather were moved by a variety of political, secular and religious motives.[11] However, some of them did work as teachers for a while, or supervised charitable organizations concerned with setting up schools and propagating education.[12]

Al-Qabbānī was the first educational pioneer who could be described as a professional, and whose academic formation in the field of education included both theory and practice. He was a competent teacher and had experience in psychology.[13] In the Higher School for Teachers, he taught courses in both education and psychology, and trained the students there in teaching techniques. Previous to that, he had shown considerable professional skill working for some years as a secondary-school teacher. He became well known as an educational innovator, both in his ideas and in his practice, especially after his return from a year's study on a scholarship to London (1917/18). During his time there he met the Pragmatics, British professors who were spreading the theories and principles of John Dewey and applying them in their new schools. He was also able to study Dewey's works himself, which were enjoying great popularity at that time, and he was encouraged by everything he read in them.

Al-Qabbānī showed unusual brilliance throughout his career as a student and practitioner.[14] He possessed a breadth of culture, combining both the ancient

and modern, with an extraordinary ability to present his ideas and to convince people. He was capable of untiring and persistent effort and great determination. Due to these abilities, other educationists recognized him as the leader of the progressive education movement in Egypt.

Without underestimating al-Qabbānī's contribution, it should be admitted that he was neither an innovative philosopher nor a modern theoretician of pragmatism. He did not come up with a totally new or fundamental idea. Pragmatism was already a mature and well-established philosophy. What does make him important and ensures his immortality as a great educational pioneer is that he was a skilful and inspired strategist, who was able to adapt pragmatism to the Egyptian and Arab milieu, and applied it with great success. The high official posts that he held assisted him in his efforts, giving him academic and executive authority.[15] This made it easier for him to carry out his reform projects, to which he devoted his whole life, and which he made the focal point of his professional, political and personal life.

The principles of pragmatism

Al-Qabbānī, together with other educationists, concentrated on 'policy and methods of education' before there was any scientific concept of educational objectives or a technique for formulating them through methodological decisions on planning, programme design, application of teaching methods or evaluation of the outcomes.[16] Up to that time, education in Egypt performed traditional functions, such as: (a) the teaching of knowledge, skills and values to form the pupil's personality and social skills; (b) passing on the cultural heritage, thus linking the present generation to the past; and (c) preparation of the work force to meet the development needs of society and ensure its progress. In al-Qabbānī's view, the most important principles defining the scope of educational policy were:

- Making elementary education universal, compulsory, free and unified. It was not reasonable that there should be eight types of institution, differing in the type of pupils, the qualifications of the teachers, the number of years of study, and programmes, methods and objectives. This sort of education system would in the end destroy the nation's character and cultural homogeneity, while confirming class differences and social discrimination.[17]
- Extending the period of compulsory schooling to form a general cultural foundation and to ensure functional skills for all pupils. This was necessary to avoid a large number of the children of ordinary citizens leaving school semi-literate, particularly those enrolled in compulsory and elementary schools not connected with, or not open to, higher stages of education. Such children would then either follow their fathers' occupations or become unemployed or underemployed. This would be a national disaster, a dissipation of the nation's human resources.

- Diversification of secondary education, whereby the majority of students, after completing the two compulsory steps of education – primary and secondary – would be directed into technical schools (agricultural, industrial or commercial); only a minority with outstanding ability would be enrolled in academic secondary schools. In this way, children would be directed to where their aptitudes and interests could be developed, so as to meet the demands of development and the labour market.
- Raising the standards of teacher training in order to produce sufficient numbers of qualified teachers in every sphere: academic, artistic and athletic; organizing in-service training programmes to improve and update teachers' qualifications. It was believed that the effectiveness and efficiency of teaching was inseparable from the effectiveness of the teacher.
- Preparation of new curricula and linking them to practical everyday life and the environment; maintaining their integration in the overall scholastic plan, in all its aspects: science, language, practical and artistic skills, religion, health, athletics and social studies.
- Suitable architectural designs for schools, making sure that they had everything necessary to make them a proper environment for the practice of all educational activities: sports, manual work, fine arts, theatrical presentations, gardening, and scientific and literary activities.

The instruction methods were borrowed unchanged from Dewey's pragmatism, in particular:

- Making the school an active human environment in which nature and society interacted rather than being remote from each other.
- Treating the child as a person and the centre of the educational process, concentrating on his/her development, responding to his/her needs and interests, keeping in step with his/her abilities.
- Learning through educational experiences which placed the child in the empirical situations of having to face real-life problems, and motivating him/her to understand and solve them in a positive and appropriate way.
- Using the project method, which supports the principle of 'learning by doing' and transforms the whole environment into a learning area, strengthening the faculties of observation, comprehension, analysis and evaluation. This is the complete opposite of the traditional method, based upon predetermined organization of subject matter unrelated to the learner's experiences and interests, and using only the method of 'read, write, listen and learn'.
- Developing the spirit of freedom, and encouraging participation in democracy, self-direction and mutual respect between young people; training would be designed to foster initiative and carry out responsibilities.
- Establishing a new role for the teacher as a counsellor of young people, one who plans the learning situations, directs pupils to where they can acquire knowledge and, when mistakes occur, corrects them. In this way, the teacher becomes an educational innovator in the school and in the local community.

Al-Qabbānī was already over 50 when he was appointed Minister of Education. This followed the military revolution of 23 July 1952. He played an important part in winning support for its principles and in the effort to attain its stated aims: unity, freedom and socialism. He drew up basic objectives for Arab education, the most important of which were:

- Education to strengthen personal and social development, in conformity with each child's individual characteristics.
- Education to strengthen each child's mental abilities, especially in critical thinking, deductive reasoning and creative imagination.
- Education to reinforce work skills and production experience adapted to the needs of the economy, and not limited to the sphere of government employment.
- Education to reinforce the spirit of enlightened citizenship and genuine Arab nationalism.[18]

Establishing the reform

For these aims and principles to be transformed from the realm of theory to organized application, al-Qabbānī and his assistants strove to embody the concepts of progressive education into institutional structures, educational programmes, technical organization, and legislative and executive policies. In this field, al-Qabbānī was particularly successful, although he faced opposition and conflict and, in many cases, found himself in material and technical difficulties. This compelled him to tackle reform with a combative spirit, accepting neither fatigue nor defeat; he was never deflected by criticism or open attack.

AN INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION FOR TEACHERS

There were numerous schools for training teachers for the various stages of education, but without any fixed organization or basis for evaluating their level of academic and educational performance.[19] This led to criticisms from experts and officials, both Egyptian and foreign. Al-Qabbānī was moved to action, and he succeeded in convincing officials of the need to create a higher institute specializing in high-quality professional preparation for all teachers in Egyptian schools. The first institute of this kind was in fact established in 1929 in Cairo, with two sections: one for primary school-teachers; the other for secondary school-teachers. The institute enjoyed a good academic and educational reputation, which made it the school of pragmatism both in theory and in practice, and a centre for educational research and professional training.[20] Along these same lines, the Institute of Education for girls was established in 1933. The parent institute was subject to several re-organizations which eventually resulted in the suppression of the section for primary teachers and the creation of a division for higher studies in 1941. It was authorized to grant academic degrees: special diplomas, Master's degrees and doctorates.

In 1945, the institute added a branch in Alexandria which, in 1947, became an independent Institute of Education under the Ministry of Education. In 1950 the parent institute became attached to the University of Ayn Shams, and then developed into a College of Education in 1956. In 1970 it expanded into a much larger college which granted the baccalaureate diploma, as well as higher academic degrees. It formed the foundation and model on the pattern of which about thirty different colleges of education were founded. They were concerned with the training of general education teachers in all subjects, including art and sport.[21]

EXPERIMENTAL CLASSES AND MODEL SCHOOLS

Al-Qabbānī followed the example of John Dewey, who had established a school for applying his theories attached to the University of Chicago (January 1896); it was a workshop for educational research and experiment outside the range of professional teacher training.

Al-Qabbānī did the same in Egypt. He began by opening experimental classes in 1932 attached to the Institute of Education, in which teacher trainees would apply what they had learned in theory and carry out pioneering experiments to produce a type of education not previously known. These classes were attended by slow learners and by the mentally and physically handicapped. Al-Qabbānī also prepared experiments on a wider scale and with normal samples of children in two secondary schools in 1937/38. In each school he appointed a director to take charge.[22]

His departure from the administrative post in the ministry in order to become a deputy director of the institute meant that there was no one to promote experimentation, which then became neglected and increasingly subject to criticism. This forced al-Qabbānī to look for some other secure and permanent vehicle for experimentation, and in 1939 he established, in the al-Qubba district of Cairo, the al-Noqrashi model primary school, adding in 1942 the al-Noqrashi model secondary school. He appointed al-Qousy, one of his chief assistants, as superintendent of both schools. Following the success of this experiment, al-Qabbānī extended it by establishing the al-Orman model school at Giza with primary and secondary divisions, and appointed another of his assistants, Muhammed Fu'ād Galāl, as its superintendent.

These schools became so well known for their organization, programmes and teaching methods that they attracted the best pupils, recruited from the sons of the enlightened bourgeoisie, the parents preferring this education to that provided in private, government and foreign schools. The very best students graduating from the institute were chosen to teach in these schools.

The innovations introduced in the model schools were highly esteemed by educators and officials and adopted by many other Egyptian schools. Perhaps one of the best educational innovations was the setting up of a 'parents' council', a new development including both parents and teachers. This council studied the

affairs of the whole school community and strengthened ties between the school and the home. This led the ministry to issue a regulation that such councils should be set up in all Egyptian schools.[23]

Thus, the model schools became a force for educational modernization, radically different from the form and content of traditional education. Al-Qabbānī became the symbol of an epoch, one rightly known as the era of 'progressive education'.

EDUCATIONAL ASSOCIATIONS

In Egypt there were societies and associations for different groups of teachers, according to their levels of teaching and the special subjects they taught. Most of these took the form of associations working for social and economic objectives. Al-Qabbānī sought to unite them and direct them towards a technical and educational objective, to improve education according to modern concepts and methods of organization.

The first association established with this specific aim in view was the Association of Modern Education, set up in 1936 by Al-Qabbānī as a branch of its headquarters in London. Its founding members numbered about eighty educationists, both men and women. This association became a pioneer in the pragmatic movement, seen for the first time in the Arab world.

Trained teachers increased in number and, in 1943, al-Qabbānī founded the Association of Graduates of the Institutes of Education. These were teachers who had been trained according to modern principles, and their high level of professional skill was recognized within society; they stood for the excellence of 'progressive education'. Al-Qabbānī was elected as the first president of this association.[24]

On this same pattern, al-Qabbānī founded the Egyptian Society for Psychological Studies so that particular attention could be paid to improving both theoretical and practical aspects of psychology in training institutes and in Egyptian schools.

THE JOURNAL OF MODERN EDUCATION

Educational journals already existed at that time in Egypt, the earliest being *The Garden of Egyptian Schools*, founded by al-Tahtāwī and first published on 16 April 1870. By 1948 there were thirty-five educational journals in Egypt.[25] However, they were all concerned with matters of instruction and the conditions of schools through light informative articles. Al-Qabbānī was not satisfied with this approach and he became the prime-mover behind the publication of the *Journal of Modern Education*, which was to be a research journal printing serious articles written by members of the Association of Modern Education. The first issue appeared in June 1948 and was published three times that year. From the following year, 1949, it was changed to a quarterly, which it has remained

ever since. Particularly in the early years, leading Egyptian, Arab and foreign educationists were invited to write for the *Journal*, which thus presented modern educational thinking to a wide readership of educators and teachers in Egypt and the Arab world.

RESEARCH AND VISITING PROFESSORS

To put an end to the somewhat disorganized educational policy followed by the authorities, which had resulted from a succession of different political parties in power implementing conflicting decisions, al-Qabbānī worked to establish a permanent academic division which would be responsible for everything connected with educational policies, regulations, projects, curricula and methods. These were to be studied methodically and objectively, well away from political pressures and changes in government. In 1940, Al-Qabbānī was chosen as the first counsellor to be its president. He was assisted by a large technical staff and well-qualified young people.

Valuable research and publications were produced by this division, contributing to the improvement and development of the education system. The position of technical counsellor was abolished in 1946, and the specialist work of this organization was referred to a deputy in the Ministry of Education.[26]

For a variety of reasons, al-Qabbānī was anxious to invite internationally renowned specialists in the field of progressive education to deliver lectures to teachers in the Institute of Education, especially on modern educational trends; they would inspect the institute and offer suggestions for its improvement; Egyptian educators would benefit from the expertise and experience of the developed countries from which they came; and they could also write articles for the *Journal of Modern Education*.

These visiting professors included the Americans Boyd H. Bode, Professor of Education at Ohio University, and Harold Rugg, Professor at Columbia University and a pioneer in the movement of educational philosophy known as Reconstitutionalism. This adds a social dimension to Pragmatism, making the school into an effective and influential force in rebuilding society on new foundations and values appropriate to the post-Second World War world. He invited Professor William Gray, who carried out well-known pioneering studies on the subject of reading. Others were the British professors Fred Clark, Berny and Depson, and the French priest, Père Boulanger.[27]

MODERNIZING EDUCATION

The Association of Modern Education, the Association of Graduates of the Institute of Education, and the Egyptian Society of Psychological Studies all worked under the leadership and supervision of al-Qabbānī at translating, writing and publishing books to assist the modernization of educational thought and practice. In the year 1948 alone, educational books were published on the

following topics: raising children, methods of teaching, teacher training, the teacher's profession and functions, combating illiteracy, theories of education, and educating parents (or raising educational awareness in families).

Al-Qabbānī joined with Professor Jackson and others in writing textbooks for students of the Institute of Education. He himself wrote the introductions to a number of books, and in 1948 four were translated into Arabic: *Groundwork of Education Theory*; *Psychologie de l'éducation*; *A Textbook on the History of Education*; and *Freedom of Action in Education*.[28]

By forming educational managers, al-Qabbānī ensured the steady growth of reform policies and projects. Even after his death they were pursued by successive generations of outstanding educationists whom he had arranged to send on scholarships to the United States of America and the United Kingdom. When these students returned to Egypt after gaining higher academic qualifications, he appointed them to the Institute of Education and entrusted them with teaching functions, scientific research and in formulating education systems in Egypt and the Arab world.

Al-Qabbānī realized the importance of organizing seminars, study circles and conferences at the local, Arab and international levels. Here were studied the most important issues included in his great project of educational reform. He wished, in particular, to invite the very best educationists who, if they all accepted a particular course of action, would have great influence with decision-makers in the highest echelons of the educational authority. He also wished their discussions and studies to have an enlightening influence which would benefit future development and the effectiveness of teaching.

While al-Qabbānī was not necessarily the sole or even the principal person responsible for preparing these seminars, study circles and conferences, he did in fact play a positive role in most of them through his contribution in thought and action. His voice was influential and most forceful in passing resolutions and recommendations. Between 1925 and 1958, there were national and international meetings on elementary education, science teaching, model schools, modern educational methods, compulsory education and inspection (or educational supervision). In 1949, al-Qabbānī arranged a general programme for teachers in which thirty-three lectures were given on various educational trends, both theoretical and practical.[29]

Al-Qabbānī worked to pass legislation and rules, as well as organizing regulations to protect his reform projects, to ensure their stability and their continued effectiveness. Among the most important of these were:

- The establishment of model rural schools (1941) and rural teachers' schools (1948) under the supervision of the Ministry of Education.
- The abolition of the primary education certificate (1941). The reason for this was that anyone obtaining this certificate, especially working-class children, found themselves obliged to enter the labour market since they were barred from any hope of further education.

- Transforming compulsory schools, which were locked in an inferior system, into educationally effective elementary schools with a new structure (1949).
- Decreeing free primary education for all (1944).
- Reorganization of the ladder of general education, then made up of two stages – primary and secondary (based on the French system since 1836) – and replacing it with three stages: primary, preparatory and secondary (1954).
- Organization of secondary education, particularly its diversification and the raising of standards (1949 and 1953).
- Including Arabic language and national culture in the curriculum of foreign schools located in Egypt, as well as within the basic subject matter of examinations.[30]

Al-Qabbānī would not have found it easy to succeed in these spheres of the institutionalization of reform had he not had a strategic methodology. He made his plans with awareness and precision, and was thus able to overcome the difficulties he faced throughout his professional life. Typical of this methodology were: (a) scientific language; (b) carefully graded progress; (c) a moderate approach; and (d) appropriate experimentation.

SCIENTIFIC LANGUAGE

Al-Qabbānī adopted a language for reform totally different from the rhetoric of politicians, which was characterized by demagogy, exaggeration and vague promises. He spoke of: experience; interests; integration of the personality; the diversity of educational activities; the development of critical thought; positive attitudes on the part of the learner; the qualifications of teachers; and other technical matters which required empirical research or objective interpretation rather than political explanations. Issues that went to the very heart of educational policy, al-Qabbānī approached from a cultural and humanistic standpoint, which others found acceptable rather than provocative. For instance, when he spoke of unifying elementary education and making it universal, and extending the period of compulsory education, he used terms such as 'social justice in a society which is still backward in every aspect of its life', and 'educating a people now illiterate who in olden times spread the light of knowledge throughout the world'. Unfortunately, his opponents were mainly educationists and administrators working in the Ministry of Education, and who begrudged him his intellectual superiority and reformist zeal.

Because of his integrity and his freedom from political ambitions and manoeuvres, he gained the confidence of the leadership at the time of the 1952 military revolution and was appointed the first Minister of Education in their new regime. He changed its aims from mere words into practical measures which took concrete shape and were expressed in specialized language.

GRADUAL CALCULATED PROGRESS

As well as being an intellectual, al-Qabbānī was realistic, and was thus able to face up to the perilous state of education. He would not disregard reality and embark on an enterprise that included a great risk of failure or rejection, nor would he take up any new ideas which were of doubtful validity. He had a special strategy based on three principles:

Reform in a global context. Al-Qabbānī did not present his plans for reform piecemeal, with each part having its own separate entity. On the contrary, he began his great reform project to develop the Egyptian education system within a wide pragmatic framework, which integrated both his ideas and the ways of applying them. This gave him a comprehensive vision, the elements of which were logically interrelated and embodied in a functional organic structure, including objectives, structures, programmes, methods, training the necessary staff to work in the administration, drawing up plans, supervision and teaching.

Reform starting from the basics. While al-Qabbānī's intellectual output included literature on all the fundamental issues in education, he adopted the issue of teacher preparation as the core of his great reform project. He took the qualification of teachers as the cornerstone of educational reform, for teacher quality was the measure of teaching. In the Institute of Education, new systems and curricula were drawn up in order to produce large numbers of qualified persons. These teachers undertook the task of speeding up the reform process and seeing that it was well implemented in a fundamentally pragmatic way.

Reform in stages. The purpose of each stage was to lay down a broad foundation for the larger and more comprehensive reform process that followed. This would mean that reform would proceed in connected stages in an on-going national process.

The Institute of Education was subjected to phased development, and the same method was employed for the unification and development of elementary education. Al-Qabbānī had decided at the beginning of his professional career on a policy of transforming the *Kuttāb* (popular Koranic schools) into well-organized schools incorporating elementary curricula and modern culture, with teachers who had obtained an acceptable level of knowledge and experience. According to the circumstances operating at that time, nothing more ambitious would have been feasible.

He set to work on improving the standard of compulsory schools, first demanding that the length of obligatory attendance be increased from four to six years. Then he sought to diversify curricula to include theoretical and practical subjects. He obtained the lengthening of school attendance from a half to a full day, as well as the provision of lunch for the pupils, and adequate health care. At a third stage, he turned to the compulsory and elementary schools set aside for

the children of peasants and labourers. These he wished to see transformed into high-quality elementary schools equivalent to the primary schools that led on to secondary and then higher education. Curricula were changed, which opened the way for transformation and preparation for the primary-certificate examination. Finally, before the July 1952 revolution, al-Qabbānī successfully incorporated all types of elementary school into a single type of primary establishment that did not recognize differences of socio-economic class, environment or religious affiliation.[31]

A MODERATE AND NORMATIVE APPROACH

Al-Qabbānī knew how to conduct his reform projects in the face of opposition, adopting a policy that respected the positive aspects put forward by the opposing parties. He would take up a conciliatory position to satisfy all those concerned, taking account of circumstances and possibilities, without compromising the fundamental methodology of the reform.

On the route towards reform, al-Qabbānī combined the long-established with the contemporary, religious values with secular ones; and while he wished to strengthen Arab nationalism, he was aware of the importance of interaction with world civilizations and the cultures of other peoples. Thus, education, as he intended it, was 'neither old and traditional, nor borrowed from the West; but is genuinely Arab, linking the past with the present, and preparing for the future'.[32]

With this belief, al-Qabbānī considered that the school must carry out a dual, though apparently contradictory, role; for him it must be 'a factor at once for preservation and renewal, so as to help the individual to acquire a cultural heritage, and at the same time prepare him to adapt and alter it. This gives him the ability to improve social systems.'[33]

In the conflict between supporters of quantity and quality in education, al-Qabbānī took up a position midway between the two. The representatives of the British colonial authority, the royal authority, the leaders of the bourgeoisie and certain intellectuals, for obvious or not-so-obvious reasons, all supported quality in education, claiming that Egypt urgently needed well-qualified cadres to take up posts in government and administration. These could be supplied only by high-quality education. While the claim for quality had won the day, the budget was directed towards founding a limited number of bourgeois schools (primary, secondary and higher education); this was at the expense of elementary education for children of the common people.[34]

In the opposite camp stood most of the political parties and the intellectuals who adopted a more liberal and open attitude, valuing the place of education in development and progress, and claiming that education for all was as vital as 'bread and water' or 'water and fresh air'.[35] They demanded that elementary education should be universal, compulsory and free; that secondary education should be more widespread, and that universities should be open to all seeking to

further their education. On this point al-Qabbānī was cautious, realizing the possible negative effects of a policy of 'quantity' in education.

At first, however, he agreed that the trend towards quantity was justified by the humanitarian need to educate a nation of whom, in 1945, 80 per cent were still illiterate, neglected and deprived of the opportunity for education.[36]

Al-Qabbānī explained the positive outcomes of educating ordinary people in a country that was newly liberated and was progressing in the scientific, economic, social and cultural spheres. He said:

> In a country in such circumstances, it is worth directing educational efforts to rescue the people from the depths of their ignorance, which spoils every aspect of their lives, and to seek to make good elementary education universal, before thinking about making secondary education universal.[37]

However, he did not seek quantity at any price, for then education would decline in significance and its effects would be lost. Therefore, he set out his policy, which kept quantity within reasonable standards while the real improvement was taking place in the availability of education.

Thus, al-Qabbānī progressed along two parallel paths of equal importance. There was numerical expansion to the extent that, in 1954 and during his time at the ministry, two primary schools were built every three days, and half of the ministry's budget was devoted to primary education. The aim was to raise this proportion to two-thirds of the education budget to meet the expense of the ever-increasing quantity and the improvement in quality: equipping schools, preparing well-qualified teachers, drawing up programmes, writing new and appropriate textbooks, etc.[38]

At the primary education stage, al-Qabbānī did not separate quantity from quality, for this level was important and essential. He called for primary education to be made universal, compulsory, of longer duration and to be unified. This would do away with the unsatisfactory system divided into: (a) popular elementary education, which was bankrupt and meager; and (b) an excellent bourgeois education intended for the children of the élite. He wrote:

> The discrimination between elementary education and primary education is based on the division of the nation into two distinct classes: a class which governs as if by right, supported by rank and prestige, and a class which is condemned to submission, hard work and low status. There is no reason to prevent the first stage of education from being unified. The cornerstone of our educational policy must be for primary education to be universal, making it one of the stages of general education (and provide the financial resources required). For whenever education becomes cheaper it becomes worse.[39]

Contrary to his usual custom, he made a provocative call – but one which was very true: 'It is impossible for a democratic education system to exist in a society ruled by feudal attitudes.'[40]

While this was his position regarding primary education, he felt that quality should take precedence for academic secondary education. This, he declared, should be for those of intellectual ability, regardless of their social background.

In his capacity as Deputy Minister of Education, credit is due to him for passing the 1949 law, which put an end to the policy of automatically accepting students for secondary education, following many complaints that the standards of secondary education were collapsing. He stressed the importance of selecting suitable candidates:

> Secondary and higher education are the means of preparing men and women who in the next generation will occupy positions of leadership in the life of the nation. Any falling of educational standards will mean a failure in the level of competence and of morality in our public life for the future. If we are allowed to make some concessions – only some – in the level of elementary education, to speed up its universalization, this is not permitted under any circumstances for secondary and higher education. It is agreed among educationists in all civilized nations that quality must come before quantity in these two stages of education, for the nation which sacrifices quality in seeking quantity is a nation which commits suicide.[41]

As soon as he became Minister of Education, therefore, he abolished the 1951 law of his predecessor, Taha Hussein,[42] which had opened the door wide to automatic acceptance into secondary education. In its place he issued the 1953 law, which reinforced the 1949 law passed when he was Deputy Minister of Education, thereby emphasizing the policy of improvement to the quality of this stage of education.

Private schools, which attracted the children of affluent Egyptians and foreign residents, were entirely the responsibility of the private sector, since they received no funds from the state.

EXPERIMENTATION

Al-Qabbānī was the first Arab exponent of experimentation in the fields of both education and psychology. For Egyptian education, despite his belief in pragmatism and the associated practical methods originating in the United States of America, he subjected everything to scientific experimentation. His aim was to adapt education to the national culture and to the availability of resources; he also aimed at reassuring those intellectuals, educationists and politicians who had doubts by letting them see for themselves that experimentation was sound and innovation successful. He aimed also at providing practical field experience to those working with these projects, which would help them to expand and advance with other educational reform projects.

We have already referred to the experimental approach in curriculum design and in the modernization of teaching methods, as practised in the experimental classes and the model schools established by al-Qabbānī for this purpose. In addition, the methodology followed by al-Qabbānī in rural education presents

another example of his belief in the importance of experimentation. He assigned to the Association of Modern Education the task of conducting serious studies to define the aims of this kind of education, the design of school buildings, specific programmes and the qualifications of its teachers. The association published a book in 1940 which included the collected outcomes of research on this subject.[43]

In 1941 the first scientific experiment was carried out in establishing a rural elementary school in the village of al-Manayel. The curricula were designed to focus on work in the fields and on the pupils' productive farming, in other words, vocational occupations. Therefore, a small-holding and a poultry yard were attached to the school, and there were also workshops for local and rural industries. Teachers and technicians were appointed who had knowledge and experience appropriate to this type of teaching. This education met the needs of young and old alike in a village which was intended to develop educationally, socially, economically, as well as in health and hygiene.

Once the school had proved successful, and government officials were convinced of its relevance, it was decided to repeat the experiment in a number of Egyptian villages. So, on the pattern of al-Manayel, thirty-five schools were established in 1943/44, and another forty-three in 1944/45.

Since there was a great need for qualified teachers, it was decided to establish a school for rural teachers in Manshat al-Qanatir in 1948, followed by a similar school in the village of Bayy al-'Arab. In both of these, the project method was used, concentrating on study of the circumstances and needs of people living in the countryside. The study subjects included: village problems, the peasant's home, food, drinking water, pest control for the cotton crop, and other similar concerns.[44]

In psychology, al-Qabbānī created a broad experimental movement concerned in particular with the codification of intelligence tests and tests of scholastic achievement. He said: 'If psychology is to move towards a pure scientific form, it must leave aside many of its concepts and begin to observe behaviour in a defined experimental situation.' He had begun to work in this way in his thirties when, in 1929, he helped Claparède in his study of the mental abilities of Egyptian students. Claparède had authorized him to supervise the conduct of the tests, which al-Qabbānī translated, revised and administered to thousands of students. He then analysed the results, drew the main conclusions and published a book which was the first of its kind in Egypt and the Arab world. This was *The Measurement of Intelligence in Primary Schools* (1938).

Together with his assistants, he produced tests to measure cognitive, mental arithmetic and mathematical skills. He prepared special training cards for carrying out various mathematical processes. He was responsible for establishing the psychological clinic at Ayn Shams University, which became a testing ground for theories and methods of psychological analysis and clinical treatment. Here people beginning their research were trained and later became specialist professors throughout Egypt and other parts of the Arab world.[45]

Pragmatism: its rise in the Arab context

Throughout the 1940s and 1950s pragmatism in the United States was increasingly criticized because of its negative aspects, which eventually led to a decline in educational standards. It was accused of: submitting to the inclinations of learners at the expense of the veritable educational aims; concentrating on physical education at the expense of acquiring sound knowledge; and giving prominence to democracy and individual freedom so as to create educational chaos, turning certain secondary schools into 'hell holes'. The idea was rampant that education was life, rather than preparation for life, and thus young people became imprisoned in the world of childhood, without being prepared to assume their proper roles in adult society.[46]

Since the supporters of pragmatism had undermined its progressive principles through their excesses and their practical shortcomings, they were not able to hold out for long against the criticism and attacks from every side, especially after the death of Dewey in 1952. They announced the disbanding of their association in 1955. In 1959, President Eisenhower officially declared the end of pragmatism and the need for a return to fundamental teaching ('back to basics'). This was especially true for the sciences which were essential to contemporary progress and could ensure success in the 'space race'. He also stressed the importance of discipline in school, as well as seriousness and responsibility in education.[47]

At the same time that pragmatism was declining in its American homeland, it flourished and spread in Egypt as a unique and irreplaceable form of education.[48] Especially after his academic visit to the United States in 1949, al-Qabbānī was very well aware of both the positive and negative aspects of pragmatism in American schools. Through reflection and political measures, he tried to avoid adopting 'dualisms', such as simultaneously promoting progressive education as well as that which opposed it. al-Qabbānī listened seriously and was convinced by Dewey's warnings to his followers; they did not take any notice of him themselves, considering that he was senile and in mental decline.

So al-Qabbānī was able, at least on the level of theory and planning, to reconcile freedom and organization (recreation and hard work), practical activities and educational materials (vocation and culture), and individual growth and co-operation.[49] He and his followers were not over-sensitive; however, they were able to accept criticism, to make modifications and to comply with change. They believed that continuous renovation is the essence of pragmatism, so long as it works in the interest of the school and of society. Thus, al-Qabbānī's pragmatism was imbued with advanced ideas and methods, and achieved outstanding success when compared with traditional schools and their didactic methods.

Successive generations of al-Qabbānī's followers carried his pragmatism beyond Egypt, and thereby changed the educational systems of the Arab countries. When al-Qabbānī died contented in 1963, his followers were able to reassure him that what he had planted would remain and flourish, and continue to produce good results in the future.

Notes

1. Al-Tahtāwī wrote extensively on education, and also reflected about and practised it. His book *al-Murshid al-amīn lil-banāt wa-l-banīn* [The Faithful Guide for Girls and Boys], 1872, is the first educational work of its kind in the Arab world. His reform theory reflected more traditional modernizing views as well as contemporary views based on the French education system, where he had spent four years studying. A profile of al-Tahtāwī is included in this series of '100 Thinkers on Education'.
2. In Ahmad Amīn's words, 'he was intended to construct buildings and great establishments, but instead he engineered, designed and implemented with great care methods of education; so he is considered one of the greatest reformers'. Ahmad Amīn, *Zu'amā' al-islāh fī l-'asr al-hadīth* [Leaders of Reform in the Reform Era], 3rd ed., pp. 208-09, Cairo, Maktabat al-nahda al-misriyya, 1971.
3. Further information on Sheikh Muhammad 'Abduh's educational thinking and efforts at reform can be found in Muhammad Rashīd Ridā's *Ta'rīkh al-ustādh al-imām al-sheikh Muhammad 'Abduh* [The History of Sheikh Imam Muhammad 'Abduh], Cairo, Matba'at al-Manār, 1931, 3 vols. Regarding the educational thinking of M. Rashīd Ridā, see the journal *al-Manār*, many issues of which contain his critical analytical essays aimed at educational reform.
4. Na'īm 'Atiya, *Ma'ālim al-fikr al-tarbawī fī l-bilād al-'arabiyya fī l-mi'a sana al-akhīra* [Trends of Educational Thought in Arab Countries in the Past 100 Years], pp. 12-107, Beirut, al-Jam'iya al-Amrikiyya, 1966. Political parties proliferated, increasing by an average of one new party each year from 1907 to 1914. See Jacob M. Landau, *Parliaments and Parties in Egypt*, pp. 139-73, Tel Aviv, Israel Publishing House, 1953.
5. Salāma Mūsā, *The Education of Salama Musa*, p. 27, Leiden, E.J. Brill, 1961.
6. *Al-Sijil al-thaqāfī* [Cultural Record], pp. 91-110, Cairo, Ministry of Education, 1948.
7. These newspapers include: *al-Muqtataf*, *al-Mu'ayyid*, *al-Ahrām*, *al-Hilāl*, *al-Manār* and *al-Kātib*.
8. Girgis Salāma, *Ta'rīkh al-ta'līm al-ajnabī fī Misr fī al-qarnayn al-tāsi' 'ashr wa-l-'ishrīn* [An Account of Foreign Education in Egypt in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries], pp. 136-256, Cairo, Supreme Council on Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences, 1963. At a certain point, there were more Egyptian than foreign pupils in these schools.
9. A profile on Edouard Claparède appears in this series of '100 Thinkers on Education'.
10. These translated books include: *Émile of the Nineteenth Century*, by the French author Skero, translated by 'Abd al-'Azīz Muhammad at the direction of Muhammad 'Abduh, published in consecutive issues of *al-Manār* with an explanation and commentary; *Education*, by Immanuel Kant, translated from an English edition by Sheikh Tantāwī Goharī; *Education*, by Herbert Spencer, translated first by Muhammed 'Abduh and subsequently by Muhammad al-Sabā'i; and *Evolution*, by Charles Darwin, translated and annotated by Shebli Shemayel.

11. Thinkers not mentioned here include: Shebli Shemayel, Ahmad Lutfī al-Sayyid, Salāma Mūsā, Hāfiz 'Afīfī and Taha Hussein (the latter also appears in this series of '100 Thinkers on Education'). Their writings expressed diverse philosophical views on education.
12. Those who taught or supervised educational associations include Sheikh Muhammad 'Abduh and Sheikh Muhammad Rashīd Ridā, through *al-'Urwā al-wuthqa* and the Islamic Charitable Association.
13. In this al-Qabbānī resembled John Dewey, founder of American pragmatism, who headed three departments – philosophy, pedagogy and psychology – at the University of Chicago in 1894. See: S. A. Rippe, *Education in a Free Society: An American History,* 4th ed., p. 205, New York; London, Longman, 1980. A profile of John Dewey appears in this series of '100 Thinkers on Education'.
14. Al-Qabbānī's talents were first discovered by the nation's leader and former Minister of Education, Sa'd Zaghlūl, when visiting village schools in Asyut in southern Egypt in 1908. In recognition of the brilliance of this child from a poor background, the minister ordered that Isma'il al-Qabbānī should receive free education in the primary school, which was at that time reserved for the sons of the élite. The minister intervened a second time on his behalf when the administration of the Higher School for Teachers would not accept him as he was under age, despite having obtained the baccalaureate. He was enrolled and graduated, as usual with distinction, as the youngest among his fellow teachers. He subsequently worked in secondary education. See: Sa'id Isma'il 'Ali, 'Isma'il al-Qabbānī rā'id fī al-tarbiya [Isma'il al-Qabbānī: A Pioneer in Education], in *Dirāsāt fī al-tarbiya wa-l-falsafa* [Studies in Education and Philosophy], pp. 315-16, Cairo, 'Alam al-kutub, 1972.
15. Al-Qabbānī worked his way through educational, managerial and political positions: as a secondary school-teacher, a professor at the Institute of Education for Teachers, secondary school principal, vice-president of the Institute of Education, then its president, a technical counsellor at the Ministry of Education, a Deputy Minister of Education and then Minister. He also founded and chaired many associations.
16. The American scientist Tyler was the first to write on educational objectives, in two books: *Achievement Tests*, 1934, and *Principles of Curriculum and Public Education,* 1950. Bloom produced *Taxonomy of Educational Objectives* (New York, Longmans, Green) in 1956. Ever since, educational theory and techniques have provided a basis for research which has influenced the definition, formulation and evaluation of educational aims. See: Jerry Pocztar, *La définition des objectifs pédagogiques* [The Definition of Educational Objectives], pp. 48-54, Paris, Editions ESF, 1982; V. and G. De Landsheere, *Définir les objectifs de l'éducation* [Defining the Objectives of Education], p. 10, Paris, PUF, 1975. Muhammad Fu'ād Galāl, one of al-Qabbānī's assistants, said in 1941 of 'educational aims and objectives': 'This is something new in Egypt'. See: M. F. Galāl, *Ittijāhāt fī al-tarbiya al-hadītha* [Trends of Modern Education], 2nd ed., p. 5, Cairo, Maktabat al-adab.
17. 'Abd al-Hamīd Fahmī Matar, *Al-Ta'līm wa-l-mutaʿattilūn fī Misr* [Education and the Unemployed in Egypt], p. 278, Alexandria, Matba'at Muhammad 'Alī al-sinā'iyya, 1939.
18. See books and studies by al-Qabbānī: *Siyāsat al-ta'līm fī Misr* [Educational Policy in Egypt], pp. 20-24, Cairo, Mathā'at lijnat al-ta'līf wa-l-tarjama wa-l-nashr, 1944; Siyāsat al-ta'līm al-jadīda [New Educational Policy], in: *Sahīfat al-tarbiya*, pp. 1-23,

Cairo, Rābitat al-tarbiya al-hadītha, March-May 1954; *Ahdāf al-ta'līm fī al-bilād al-'arabiyya* [Educational Objectives in the Arab Countries] (first cultural season of lectures, ninth lecture), pp. 143-56, Kuwait, Matba'at hukūmat al-Kuwait, 1955; *Dirāsāt fī tanzīm al-ta'līm bi-Misr* [Studies on the Organization of Education in Egypt], pp. 102-41, Cairo, Maktabat al-nahda al-Misriyya, 1958. Muqadimma [Introduction], in Ya'qub Fam (ed.), *Dirāsāt fī l-akhlāq* [Studies in Ethics], Cairo, 1931.

19. Matar, op. cit., pp. 270-76.
20. Muhammad Munīr Mursī in Wahīb Sim'an and M. M. Mursī, *Al-Madkhal fī al-tarbiya al-muqārana* [Introduction to Comparative Education], p. 385, Cairo, Anglo-Misriyya, 1973. Al-Qabbānī mentioned that John Dewey's views and their social and educational applications were taught with care in the Institute of Education, where they attracted the interest of educationists.
21. S. I. 'Alī in S. Mursī Ahmad and S. I. 'Alī (eds.), *Ta'rīkh al-tarbiya wa-l-ta'līm* [History of Education], pp. 306-09, Cairo, 'Alam al-kutub, 1980.
22. In 1937 al-Qabbānī worked as principal of Fu'ād al-awwal Secondary School, later renamed al-Hasaniyya, and then in 1938 as principal of Fārūq al-awwal Secondary School, later renamed Isma'il al-Qabbānī Secondary School.
23. 'Alī, op. cit., pp. 301-02.
24. *Al-Sijil al-thaqāfī* [Cultural Record], Cairo, Ministry of Education, 1949, pp. 214-15. See also Roderick Mathews and Mattā 'Aqrāwī, *Al-Tarbiya fī l-sharq al-awsat al-'arabī* [translated from *Education in the Arab Middle East*], p. 9, Beirut, al-Matba'a al-'asriyya, 1949. The association was renamed the Association of Graduates of Institutes and Colleges of Education due to the growing numbers of educational institutes that later became colleges of education.
25. *Al-Sijil al-thaqāfī*, op. cit., pp. 164-65.
26. Ibid., p. 57.
27. Ibid., pp. 164-65.
28. Mursī, op. cit., p. 320.
29. 'Alī, op. cit., pp. 298-99.
30. A. Radwan, *Old and New Forces in Egyptian Education: Proposals for the Reconstruction of the Programme of Egyptian Education in the Light of Recent Cultural Trends*, pp. 107-10, New York, Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1951.
31. See al-Qabbānī's *Dirāsāt* . . ., op. cit., pp. 103-09, and his *Siyāsat al-ta'kīm al-jadīda*, op. cit., pp. 7-9.
32. Al-Qabbānī, *Ahdāf al-ta'līm* . . ., op. cit., p. 18.
33. S. I. 'Alī in: *Dirāsāt* . . ., op. cit., pp. 328-29.
34. A supporter of the qualitative approach is Muhammad 'Awad, a former president of Cairo University and Minister of Education, who wrote: 'It is no policy to emphasize quantity rather than quality . . . it is better to have one mature crop than a hundred immature crops'. See: M. 'Awad, Misr fi azma [Egypt in Crisis], *Majallat al-Hilāl* (Cairo), No. 56, Vol. 12, December 1948, pp. 11-16. Lord Cromer, head of the British administration in Egypt, used to say that incomplete education would never prepare qualified Egyptians capable of self-government. However, in response to his claim, Ahmad Lutfī al-Sayyid, a liberal leader and former Minister of Education, refuted this: 'Some people say that ignorance is better than incomplete education; but, while ignorance is non-existence, partial education is a degree of

educational existence, and existence is always better than non-existence.' See A. L. al-Sayyid, *Safhāt matwīya min ta'rīkh al-haraka al-istiqlāliyya fī Misr* [Pages from the History of the Independence Movement in Egypt] from March 1907 to March 1909, p. 120, Cairo, al-Mukhtārāt al-siyāsiyya, 1946.

35. Rifa'a al-Tahtāwī (d. 1873) was the first to say 'Education [for all people] is like bread and water', quoting from the Imām Ibn Hanbal. Later, Taha Hussein, a former Minister of Education from 1950 to 1952, would often repeat the saying: 'Education is like air and water.'
36. Al-Qabbānī, *Dirāsāt fī tanzīm* . . ., op. cit., p. 103.
37. Ibid., p. 103.
38. Ibid., p. 104.
39. Al-Qabbānī, *Siyasat al-ta'lim* . . ., op. cit., pp. 41-72.
40. Ibid., p. 7.
41. Al-Qabbānī, *Dirāsāt fī tanzīm* . . ., op. cit., p. 190.
42. A profile of Taha Hussein also appears in this series of '100 Thinkers on Education'.
43. *Al-Madrasa al-awwaliyya al-rīfiyya* [The Rural Elementary School], Cairo, Lijnat al-ta'līf wa-l-tarjama wa-l-nashr, 1940.
44. Ibrāh-im 'Ismat Mitāwi' (Metawy), Isma'īl al-Qabbānī rā'id al-ta'līm al-rīfī [Isma'-il al-Qabbānī: Pioneer of Rural Education], *Sahīfat al-tarbiya*, March 1964, p. 13.
45. Ahmad Zakī Sālih, al-Qabbānī wa-'ilm al-nafs [Al-Qabbānī and Psychology], *Sahīfat al-tarbiya*, January 1964, pp. 26-34.
46. See Paul Woodring, *A Fourth of a Nation*, 1957, translated into Arabic as *Nahwa falsafa lil-tarbiya* [Towards a Philosophy of Education], p. 183, Cairo, 'Alam al-kutub, 1966.
47. 'Abd al-Samī Sayyid Ahmad, Azmat al-huwīya fī l-fikr al-tarbawī fī Misr [Identity Crisis for Educational Thought in Egypt], in *Dirāsāt tarbawiyya*, Cairo, November 1985, pp. 146-47.
48. An Egyptian researcher wrote: 'The progressive theory of John Dewey has dominated the field of education in Egypt in particular, and the rest of the Arab world in general, through the periods of ideological development . . . and has blocked the Arab mind from creativity.' *Al-Tarbiya al-mu'asira* (Cairo), May 1985, p. 6.
49. Al-Qabbānī reflected on this kind of attractive educational awareness in a study 'Falsafa ta'līmiyya jadīda' [New Educational Philosophy], given in two lectures at the American University in Beirut, May 1955. See: al-Qabbānī, *Dirāsāt fī tanzīm* . . ., op. cit., pp. 244-60. See also its fifth section, 'Usus al-tarbiya 'an tarīq al-nashāt fī falsafat John Dewey' [Foundations of Education Through Activity in the Philosophy of John Dewey], *Al-Tarbiya 'an tarīq al-nashāt* [Education Through Activity], 2nd ed., pp. 165-66, 190-91, Cairo, Lijnat al-ta'līf wa-l-tarjama wa-l-nashr, 1984.

HERBERT READ

(1893–1968)

David Thistlewood

In all things, moral and intellectual, we should act on the belief that we really possess only what we have conquered ourselves – that we are made perfect by natural habits, but slaves by social conventions; and that until we have become accustomed to beauty we are not capable of truth and goodness, for by beauty we mean the principle of harmony which is the given order of the physical universe, to which we conform and live, or which we reject and die [Read, 1944, p. 25].

Introduction

Herbert Read was a poet devoted to the evocation of vivid pictorial imagery, especially of his native northern English countryside. He was also a historian of ceramics and stained glass, and was strongly committed to the modern revitalization of industrial design. He was a literary critic, contributing important studies of the English Romantic poets, such as Wordsworth, Coleridge and Shelley. Twice decorated for bravery in the First World War, he subsequently became a pacifist and theoretical anarchist. His unconventional politics did not prevent his being honoured with a knighthood, nor his belonging to the British cultural establishment, as signified in honorary professorships and prestigious lectureships. But, in spite of this diversity of achievement, he is best remembered as a critic of, and apologist for, the avant-garde art of his lifetime – particularly English and European Modernism (Thistlewood, 1984) – and as a profound explicator and defender of children's creativity.

His interests in art education, though nascent in his earlier aesthetic theorizing, did not develop fully until he was approaching his fiftieth year. They emerged from his interests in theories and practices illuminating the position of the avant-garde within the socio-political flux. The subject of child art was at first of subsidiary importance: arguments about a 'pre-logical' essence within avant-garde creativity could be supported with reference to properties apparent in both primitive art and the imagery of children. However, he became deeply interested

in children's drawings and paintings after having been invited to collect works for an exhibition of British art which was to tour Allied and neutral countries during the Second World War. As it was considered too risky to transport across the Atlantic Ocean works of established importance to the national heritage, it was proposed that children's drawings and paintings should be sent instead.

Read, in making his collection, was unexpectedly moved by the expressive power and emotional content of some of the younger artists' works. This experience prompted his special attention to their cultural value, and his engagement of the theory of children's creativity with a seriousness matching his devotion to the avant-garde. This work both changed fundamentally his own life's work throughout his remaining twenty-five years and provided art education with a rationale of unprecedented lucidity and persuasiveness. Key books and pamphlets resulted: *Education through Art* (Read, 1943); *The Education of Free Men* (Read, 1944); *Culture and Education in a World Order* (Read, 1948); *The Grass Roots of Art* (Read, 1955); and *Redemption of the Robot* (Read, 1970).

As these titles suggest, Read elaborated a socio-cultural dimension of creative education, offering the notion of greater international understanding and cohesiveness rooted in principles of developing the fully balanced personality through art education. Child art was the driving force of this philosophy: the heroic task of education was to prevent the young child from losing access to whatever ancient, ingrained, cultural wisdom he or she was able to manifest in symbolization. Read's last years were devoted to the proclamation of this philosophy throughout the world, especially in the proceedings of the International Society for Education through Art, which he was instrumental in establishing under the auspices of UNESCO.

Life and intellectual biography

Read was the son of a tenant farmer in North Yorkshire, and his first perception of the world was of an utterly stable, conservative, rural community. In 1903, however, when he was 10, his father died and his family was dispossessed of its tenancy. His mother entered domestic service, he being boarded at an orphanage school in Halifax before leaving, at the earliest opportunity, to become a bank clerk in Leeds. The obvious facts of industrial poverty around him challenged inherited political prejudices and, by the time he entered Leeds University in 1912 to study economics (after having matriculated at evening classes), he was a ready participant in socialist debates.

He began to read *The New Age*, among the leading journals of socialist politics and aesthetics of its day. He became a regular contributor to the paper throughout a period in which it was a vehicle for promoting socialist alternatives to Fabianism, a movement dedicated to opposing capitalism by debate and force of argument rather than precipitate action. Read himself differed with the Fabians not so much on questions of revolution as of materialism. In pursuit of improving wages and conditions, and increasing workers' share of goods, the

Fabians appeared willing to surrender fundamental socialist principles, notably the aesthetic and spiritual goals of 'Arts and Crafts' reformers, such as William Morris.

In Read's earliest childhood memories, even the most severely exploited workers had experienced the satisfactions of working with the land, with growth and harvest and with animal husbandry, and even the meanest tasks had been acknowledged periodically in thanksgivings, seasonal festivities and other kinds of common celebration. His images of work were of hard toil cheerfully endured in the countryside, of industrial processes centred upon the village forge or 'smithy', and of urban employment housed in small-scale machine sheds – an imagery very similar to Piotr Kropotkin's, whose writings he admired.

Read's early contribution to socio-political thought, published in the relatively obscure periodical *The Guildsman* in 1917, was to propose a theory of economic groupings and networks in which both localized and internationalized interests would have been fused. Rural industries would run on anarchistic principles, while the world's urban centres would form such an interlocked system of economic mutual dependence as to make any future international conflict – such as the war he had recently fought in – impossible. He saw trade unions and industrial federations as prototype economic groups which, with only a little more purpose, could be the regulators of an international economy; and, like the Marxists, he could foresee the withering away of the state, though not into extinction but to a size commensurate with its remaining responsibilities, virtually all of which, to Read, would have been cultural.

Read's political beliefs had roots in these convictions – another war is unthinkable; the state has no economic purpose; and the ideal form of government is one that guarantees utmost equality while preserving individual freedoms, including the right of an individual to become detached from those community interests into which he or she had been accidentally projected by birth. This is precisely what had happened to Read as a result of his father's premature death, his own dislocation from the locality of his birth, and his having found a role outside the agricultural community. His position was summarized in his critical appreciation of Julien Benda's book *La Trahison des clercs* [Treason of the Intellectuals] (Benda, 1928) in which a series of propositions were found to be so strikingly familiar that they came as self-revelations.

All real human existence is the existence of an individual, either of an individual person or of a common-interest group, and is competitive and necessarily aggressive. The *clerc* or disinterested person of learning is one who protests against a morality of aggression by proclaiming ideal values revealed in contemplation of matters abstract, universal and infinite. Civilized humanity is made possible by the coexistence and synthesis of aggressive expediency and disinterested philosophy. A world observing only a code of practical necessity would be barbarous: one that practised only a code of ideals would cease to exist. Real existence admits the gradual softening of aggression with idealism.

Read (having left the British Army with the rank of captain, having worked

for a brief time as a government civil servant at the Treasury, and then having transferred his employment within the Civil Service to an assistant keepership of ceramics at the Victoria and Albert Museum) naturally identified with the dislocated individual who, while leading an ostensibly unproductive life, had the special purpose of divining abstract principles for the benefit of the wider community in an age of idealism following, and counteracting, a period of great international aggression. At this time in his life, like his poet friend T. S. Eliot, and the classicist T. E. Hulme, whose collected works he had edited (Hulme, 1924), Read considered the goals of aesthetic contemplation to be formal precision, harmony and elegant proportion – principles which, he firmly believed, when evident in literature, art and conduct, offered the world the prospect of an international medium of understanding.

This was in the 1920s. In the following decade he also advocated the very opposite of formal precision, harmony and elegant proportion, urging society's artists and art theorists to cultivate the irrational and imprecise. This new dimension was stimulated by Read's discovery of the celebration of the irrational creative act in Surrealism (Read, 1936), besides his own liberation from the civil service – first in order to be Professor of Fine Art at Edinburgh University (1931/32) and subsequently to be editor of *The Burlington Magazine* (1933-39). But a prime contributory factor also was his perception of changes taking place in European politics, in particular the rise of aggressive German nationalism. He saw it as no coincidence that this nationalism attempted to eradicate avant-garde art of both Abstract and Surrealist tendencies. It seemed obvious to Read that communism and fascism were about to confront each other for the domination of Europe, and that, even if the United Kingdom were not directly involved, individuals at least would be obliged to take sides. Though he recognized that repressive state capitalism was the Soviet reality (Read, 1937, pp. 266-73), Read was prepared to countenance communism for he saw in it an essence which promised respect for disinterested ideals.

He flirted with philosophical communism, but was finally dissuaded from close association with this movement because of its antipathy towards all realities of art, except the one it had contrived in 'social realism'. He was appalled to discover that, like fascism, it had stamped out avant-garde art; and his conclusion was that contemporary art had to become active rather than contemplative, partisan rather than disinterested, and subliminal rather than super-evident. In other words, artists and theorists had to adopt a militancy of a sort that was, in the 1930s, most apparent in Surrealism, and contemporary aesthetics had to assume less easily victimized forms. The most prominent themes of *Art and Society* (Read, 1937) were that the greatest art of the past had belonged to communal societies, and that the modern artist, conscious of an ability to transform the world by his or her visions of a new reality, had to become a more consistent communist than those, so-called, who would compromise with the aesthetic conventions of a last phase of capitalism.

He hesitated to use the term 'anarchism' to describe his preferred culture

and politics because of its undesirable connotations of violence. But he came to believe that he had no choice because other concepts were even more tainted. Communism, in its Soviet form, opposed individual creativity while shoring up the state and its bureaucracies. Fabianism was unredeemably materialistic. And socialism was either soulless or soaked in nostalgic mock-medievalism. In spite of the fact that he knew he would thus forfeit any serious consideration of his views in the United Kingdom (Read, 1940, p. 136), he took the concept 'anarchism' to be the most appropriate encapsulation of his beliefs because it embraced principles of individual freedom, self-determination, and a social framework of common-interest groupings, to which he himself added the idea of an avant-garde, agitating on behalf of free creativity (Read, 1938; Read, 1954; Read, 1968, pp. 76-93).

The fundamental changes in intellectual direction which affected Read at around his fortieth year, persuading him to identify with theoretical anarchism (Woodcock, 1972) and also to recognize the apparently contradictory claims of Abstraction and Surrealism in avant-garde art, also prompted his critical revision of the formative stages of his own philosophical development. Read recalled that his earliest contact with art had been with avant-garde painting. He had been an utterly conventional 19-year-old (conservative, Christian, and with bourgeois aspirations) when he had encountered works by Paul Gauguin, Vincent van Gogh, Paul Klee and, particularly, Wassily Kandinsky – in the house where a friend of his mother had become housekeeper – and these had so shocked and fascinated him that he had been driven to an equally shocking and subversive literature for explanations. He had read Bergson and Nietzsche, Hegel, Marx and Kropotkin, discovering explanations linking the aesthetic and the socio-political. This experience sowed the seeds of those moral and spiritual convictions that would become fully realized in early middle age, and his retrospection on this fact confirmed for him the authority of the aesthetic imperative.

The explanations he had found in philosophy were, he believed, weaker versions of truths perceptible in their most potent forms in the works of art themselves. This initiated a number of subsequently consistent beliefs: human concepts, of all kinds whatsoever, originate aesthetically by virtue of insight, and only subsequently percolate through philosophy and other forms of interpretation and use, eventually to become effective upon general life and conduct. Society needs special individuals – members of avant-gardes – possessing heightened sensibilities necessary for engaging such truths or realities. Ordinary people, too, require some awareness of this process of origination and dissemination. In the short term, this was to be provided by Read and others like him – intermediaries between society and its most creative artists. In the longer term, however, interpretation would be largely superfluous, because by virtue of reformed educational practices everyone, in some special way, would be an artist, and comprehension of the work of avant-gardes would be so much the more direct.

As for the avant-gardes themselves: their authentic creativity, though invariably individual in conception, would not be the property of individuals. It

would be effected by individuals who happened (Read would have said involuntarily) to be the sensitive registers of an evolving intelligence comprising the whole social body. His vision of society required the special creativity of certain accomplished individuals, and also the special creativity latent within everyone, because it would only be by extraordinary means that new aesthetic perceptions might be won on behalf of society as a whole, as a vital aspect of a constant, necessary process of social renewal and reinvigoration.

His concept of the avant-garde was therefore not élitist: it simply referred to the extraordinary insight required to give shape to some value or truth newly perceived or perceived anew. And it referred to a cohort functioning as if it had no choice in the matter, for an occupation demanding constant nervous activity, and erratic fluctuation between achievement and despair, would surely have been the conscious choice of very few. It became Read's vocation to speak for such necessary 'outsiders', those exerting perceptive shaping influence upon the stream of ordinary events they could never join or rejoin, and to attempt to influence some co-ordination of their creative originality. It became a consequent objective to raise the consciousness of ordinary people by means of education through art; and his amused realization that this was considered subversive (while encouragement of *really* subversive avant-garde art was not) reinforced his inclination to call himself an anarchist.

The prevailing condition of creative education

In what sense did Read's educational beliefs threaten conventional practices? When he began to take an interest in educational philosophy in the mid-1930s, art education in the United Kingdom had been stabilized around certain conventional principles for over fifty years. In spite of decentralized authority in matters of curriculum, with responsibility for subject content resting with individual headteachers, the maintenance of standards was effectively in the hands of professional bodies such as the National Society of Art Masters (NSAM) and – to a much lesser degree – the Art Teachers' Guild (ATG). The NSAM was dedicated to the preservation of drawing as an academic discipline, and possession of its certificates indicated a teacher's competence both in classical draughtsmanship and in design allied to the industrial arts. The interests of the ATG centred on the specific educational needs of young children; but, largely confined to infant application, they were thus of little threat to a system of drawing education that began seriously when pupils were old enough to apply intellectual rigour to their work.

There was a tacit distinction between the 'higher' discipline of teaching drawing and design, and the 'lower' discipline of teaching art. The former was associated with national economic purposes and aspired to academic respectability; the latter evoked 'play' and rather modest learning. The former had historic justification for calling itself Art (with a capital 'A') and a sense of belonging to traditions of classical scholarship. The latter had a romantic outlook which, along

with such things as simple dress, vegetarianism and a belief in the spiritual value of craftwork, had been a by-product of the English Arts and Crafts Movement.

The aims of the NSAM were effected by encouraging its members to pursue high levels of technical accomplishment as measured by its own examination system – the true descendant of a Victorian system of achievement-recognition in which the most demanding exercises required months of unremitting attention to the copying, shading and rendering of prescribed images circulated by the Victoria and Albert Museum (Macdonald, 1970, pp. 143-252). The ATG, on the other hand, was much more concerned with tactical approaches necessary for encouraging an essential creativity – an 'originating' activity – in children not specifically destined for an aesthetic way of life. The ATG's referents therefore included theories of child-centred creativity, and it became its prime purpose to propagate the ideas of such innovators as Ebenezer Cooke and Franz Cizek, whose arguments centred on the proposition that art was an aspect of human development, the absence of which impaired mental growth and social fitness. Before the 1930s such beliefs were regarded as peripheral to the main educational tasks of teaching drawing and design, and their attendant practices were considered at best 'preparatory' to this mission.

The values embedded in the NSAM – what may be termed the 'classic thesis' of twentieth-century art education – had been confirmed in recommendations for this discipline following the government's Education Act of 1918. These recommendations affected not only the United Kingdom, but its Dominions and all other countries sharing an anglo-saxon culture. They were the NSAM's initiative, and they comprised an emphasis on drawing (both conventional and observational) and design (the realization of artefacts through practical involvement with materials), the twin features of a specifically modern, industrially strategic education. For example, the 1918 Act enabled local governments to provide extensive post-school continuation classes for young workers entering art industries, and also to admit apprentices to half-time courses in art schools. Such trainees had special courses devoted to their crafts and industries, but their diets also included the kind of drawing fostered by the NSAM.

Thus they would participate in 'figure drawing', 'drawing from nature', and 'architectural and ornamental drawing', in which great emphasis would be placed on the received methodologies of tracing, hatching, shading and rendering that formed the disciplinary spine of the NSAM's own standards of competence. This linked academic drawing to the perceived needs of industry and thus directly to conceptions of national well-being. Individual-centred values could be accommodated to this scheme only if confined to the education of the young child. This was regarded as the ATG's province: throughout the 1920s and early 1930s this organization had persevered with a defence of free, spontaneous creativity as both obviously present in the drawings and paintings of young children, and also desirable in continuation beyond adolescence – that is, beyond the stage in an individual's development when 'unstructured' creativity was deemed normally to cease.

Marion Richardson (Richardson, 1948) was the champion of this proposal, and her work with young, adolescent and teenage pupils was regarded as proof that inherent, spontaneous creative aptitudes could be protracted beyond their stage of supposed decline. Her approach was based upon stimulation of the pupil's imagination with unconventional teaching, evoking vivid mental images through verbal discourse and cultivation of pictorial memory (Macdonald, 1970, pp. 320-54). Richardson enjoyed the support of theorists such as Roger Fry, who compared the work of her children to that of expressionist avant-garde artists. Such comparisons dignified 'child art' as being in some sense a 'natural' or 'proper' form of creativity, lost in conventional education, and regained only with the greatest difficulty by those few adult artists sufficiently motivated to eliminate intellectual processes from their art-making. This emphasis on individualism, especially in the 1930s when it emerged as an equally well-argued alternative to the conventional, may be regarded as the 'romantic antithesis' of twentieth-century art education.

What was thus established by the time Read took an intense interest in the field were: (a) an overtly subject-centred system in operation, comprising individualist art in the earliest years of education, via conventional art and design in the later years, to continuing education and training in tandem with craft trades and industries; and (b) a growing body of theory and practice supporting the proposal that it was precisely the intervention of conventional teaching that extinguished spontaneous creativity in and beyond adolescence.

Read's philosophy of education through art

Read's interest in child art was at first peripheral to his interpretation of the significance of the avant-garde. In an early engagement of the subject, he suggested (Read, 1933, pp. 46-47) that more could be learned of the essential nature of art from its origins in the primitive, and its continued rehearsal in childhood imagery, than from its intellectual elaboration in great periods of culture – an elaboration conventionalized in formal education. Children, he wrote, do not distinguish between the ideal (the conventionalized) and the 'real'. Child art was to be regarded as an intensification of children's elementary perceptions of the reality of the world around them, which he considered also a paramount purpose of the avant-garde.

However, in this discussion there is no evidence that Read supported the notion of a necessary 'continuity' of child and mature creativity. Their common feature he recognized as 'play', which in the adult realm was confined to 'special individuals who have special faculties – not of feeling or of thought – but of expression, of objectification'. In other words, authentic creativity in adults is confined to individuals of particular, pre-logical disposition. This was not, for the time being, to countenance the possibility that all members of the adult community might aspire equally to creative fulfilment.

Instead, Read at first seemed to endorse the legitimacy of one kind of educational provision for children who would become 'artists' and another for future artisans and all the rest. It is not difficult to detect Benda's influence in suggestions that society required some external shaping guidance provided by disinterested visionaries, but that there had to be safeguards against a proliferation of visionaries too great to be supported by productive labour. Read argued this case in *Art and Society* (Read, 1937), maintaining that a consequent responsibility of art teachers would be to distinguish between the education of positive, creative capabilities in the few who would be initiators, and the encouragement of taste, discrimination and appreciation in the many who would be consumers. This view accommodated the Freudian conception of the artist as a potential neurotic who had chanced upon ways of evading this fate by expressing what would have been repressed fantasy in plastic form.

One of the most original features of Read's philosophy in its perfected state was the extension of this principle to embrace everyone. The artist is no longer to be regarded as unusual in his or her potential neurosis: modern humanity in general suffers this propensity. In *Education through Art* (Read, 1943), published only six years after *Art and Society*, everyone – that is, every child – is said to be a potential neurotic capable of being saved from this prospect, if early, largely inborn, creative abilities were not repressed by conventional education. Everyone is an artist of some kind whose special abilities, even if almost insignificant, must be encouraged as contributing to an infinite richness of collective life. Read's newly expressed view of an essential 'continuity' of child and adult creativity in everyone represented a 'synthesis' of the two opposed models of twentieth-century art education that had predominated until this point.

What prompted this change of outlook was Read's direct (more than theoretical) encounter with the work of the very young. He was invited to advise the British Council on a collection of children's art for wartime exhibition overseas, and in the course of this he had come across an image, drawn by a five-year-old girl, which she called *Snake around the World and a Boat* (Read, 1943, p. 187; Read, 1968, pp. 44-45). He was deeply moved, he said, upon immediately recognizing this image as a mandala, an ancient symbol of psychic unity, universally found in prehistoric and primitive art and in all the principal cultures of history. The child, of course, could not attach meaning to what she had done; but Read, aware for some time of what until now had been merely an interesting hypothesis of Carl Gustav Jung's, was shocked to find phenomenal evidence of archetypal imagery. He then discovered an astonishing consistency in children's art of symbols Jung had associated with community stability, and he also found them replete in the paintings and sculptures of the adult avant-garde.

The most significant of these images, to Read, was the mandala, invariably a unified shape, perhaps in the form of a flower or some other four-fold arrangement, with a distinct centre, the appearance of an unfolding, and a gathering perimeter. Especially in Eastern philosophy, though also for example in Christian iconography, these images had been held to symbolize collective thought and

mutual belonging. Other archetypes which gave Read shocks of recognition were the tendency to fabricate a 'dark shadow' from aspects of a personality opposed to those personified in the self; and the tendency to protest against isolation, individuation and independence by creating mother-images, earth forms, and other symbols of dependence.

All of these projections-beyond-self – a fixing upon abstract unities; a collation of personality traits in externalized forms; the celebration of maternity; an acknowledgement of belonging to the land – Read thought, were fundamentally anarchistic. Manifest in the work of the avant-garde, their purpose was to guide the collective unconscious into normal patterns of aspiration and behaviour and away from those sinister alternatives (mass hysteria, nationalistic pride, dumb subservience to the state) to which the unnatural mode of modern life had left people prone. This remedial function, however, would wither into obsolescence if the self-same imagery, evident in child art generally, could be protracted into adulthood for everyone.

Read's encounter with the archetypal content of child art demanded explication. It was this research, conducted at the University of London in 1941/42, that resulted in his seminal work *Education through Art*, the central premises of which were: 'that the general purpose of education is to foster the growth of what is individual in each human being, at the same time harmonizing the individuality thus educed with the organic unity of the social group to which the individual belongs' (Read, 1943, p. 8). The 'organic principle', signifying normal, unhampered development of individual creativity, and a corresponding development of society through collective creative enterprise, was thus adopted as both generator and evaluative principle.

This book provided art education with a rationale, a defence and an optimistic programme. It comprised: (a) definitions of authenticity in art and art-making; (b) offered explanations of the materializing of images from the imagination; (c) compared typologies discernible in the literature of psychology and in the study of children's drawings and paintings; and (d) proposed that the 'variety' evident within such typologies supported the principle that everyone could be regarded as a special kind of artist. Realization of this principle obliged Read to revise the relevant passages of future editions of *Art and Society* (Read, 1945, p. 107).

In *Education through Art*, then, the 'organic' principle was deployed in defining 'art', which – reasonably interpreted as 'good form' – could be illuminated by scientific analogy. Good form is perceptible in all manner of natural organisms at microscopic, normal and macroscopic scales, and exhibits such attributes as structural order, elegance, harmony, economy, and dynamic equilibrium – as revealed to Read by the scientific philosophy of D'Arcy Wentworth Thompson (Thompson, 1942; Read, 1943, pp. 18-19).

Objectified in art-making, such properties evince balance, symmetry and rhythm, thus suggesting the comparability of growth in nature and composition in art. But for Read their applicability was not confined to objective art (that is,

an art of purely formal relationships). The subjective also respects these principles to the degree that it is 'externalized' (objectified) feeling, intuition or emotion; and, Read speculated, the subjective may also tend to formal relationships even when 'internalized', for fantasy and dreaming may be instigated by pathological complexes akin to force systems, and be subject to intrinsic dramatic unities and patterns of organization (Read, 1943, p. 32).

He therefore maintained that a comparability of nature and art extends across the whole range of creative faculties that produce and appreciate art. He presented a digest of psychological research demonstrating the inherent complexity of the human mind, especially in its great variety of 'forces', 'impulses' or 'drives', and he suggested correlations between mental types recognized by psychologists, their characteristic impulses, and the sorts of imagery these impulses might manifest (Read, 1943, p. 28). Enough of a consensus was evident for Read to generalize on the basis of his undoubtedly profound knowledge of the avant-garde creative processes he had studied at length – of contemporary artists in great number (Read, 1933); of the Surrealists (Read, 1936); and of English artists and Europeans working in the United Kingdom, particularly Henry Moore, Barbara Hepworth, Ben Nicholson, Paul Nash and Naum Gabo – studies of whom he published retrospectively (Read, 1952). He therefore proposed that a distinction of avant-garde creativity as between (a) realism, (b) superrealism, (c) expressionism and (d) constructivism offered a comprehensive categorization of all evident modes, and that these correlated directly with the psychological functions of (a) thinking, (b) feeling, (c) sensation and (d) intuition.

He was particularly interested in the idea of an impulse-driven emergence of imagery from the subconscious into conscious attention by the reflex co-ordination of mental, physical and perceptual faculties. Conjoining Freudian and Jungian philosophy, he wrote of the 'calling-up' of images – images with primordial significance – from hidden depths of the mind. This formed theoretical connections between the artist's command of eidetic visualization (mental evocation or recall of images in vivid detail) and an archetypal significance (deep-seated social and cultural symbolism) that could be divined in the images so evoked. It also associated socio-cultural symbolism with modes of creativity that rejected conventional, long-implemented methods of art education, concerned as they were with replication of 'given' realities rather than evocation of the 'new'.

Ultimately, however, *Education through Art* was received as proof that a number of distinct types of child artist could be identified in education, and a varied diet offered them that would both strengthen their natural affinities and credit their unique achievements. In his study of children's images Read discovered eight distinct categories, all transcending age or stage development. He suggested they corresponded to the four composite categories of mature creativity – 'realism: thinking'; 'superrealism: feeling'; 'expressionism: sensation'; and 'constructivism: intuition' – if each of these were considered in both introverted and extroverted modes (Read, 1943, p. 145).

By this means Read constructed a co-ordinate system that would account

for the characteristics of all apparent tendencies in child art. Moreover, this categoric division related directly to tendencies perceptible in the works of mature avant-gardes. The pursuit of authentic avant-garde creativity, Read had long maintained, was so emotionally and nervously demanding that it was the conscious choice of very few. In the adult's realm it was an 'obsessional' activity, while paradoxically in the child's realm it manifested the effortlessness of inherited reflex behaviour. This suggested a normality of creative identification shared between all children and those adults who would strive to regain pre-logical sensibility. It also suggested a fundamental abnormality in what had been considered normal in conventional education, namely the intervention of logical, intellect-dependent education at around the age of 10. If education were to go with the grain of the biological imperative, ways needed to be found of encouraging the perfection and protraction of pre-logical creative states.

Read did not offer a curriculum but a theoretical defence of the genuine and true. His claims for genuineness and truth were based on the overwhelming evidence of characteristics revealed in his study of child art. But they were founded also in speculative extrapolation of a kind that was most welcome during the Second World War (when his ideas received first publication), in the period of reconstruction (when they were recognized in the 1944 Education Act), and in succeeding decades dominated by Cold War politics. This extrapolation focused on the apparent fact that authentic creativity was an inherent human necessity. The question was why was it so necessary as to be universally present (though in eight complementary modes) in all children, and potentially present in the citizens they were to become?

Read discovered the answer in social psychology, at the same time confirming his predilection for anarchism and his recognition of profundity in Jung's conception of the archetype. The biological necessity has two aspects – to call up imagery from the subconscious and to externalize it in communicable form – the second of which is served by the originating activity and is therefore the more important. He argued that this is not an outpouring for its own sake, nor is it evidence of children conversing with, and confirming, their own individual subconscious experience: it is essentially 'an overture demanding response from others' (Read, 1943, p. 164, quoting Suttie, 1935). It is thus to be regarded as an integrating activity, 'a spontaneous reaching out to the external world, at first tentative, but capable of becoming the main factor in the adjustment of the individual to society' (Read, 1943, pp. 164-65). This not only establishes art – an authentic, non-intellectualized art – as of profound significance in education, it downgrades all other subjects in the curriculum intended to develop 'individuation', or rather maintains that they too may serve 'integration' if taught with artistic focus.

Impact and influence

When published, Read's philosophy gave new meaning to the work of many

thousands of art teachers. Instead of merely assisting technical expertise, recreational skill and consumer discrimination, their role would be to take command of the larger curriculum, and help innate creative abilities survive in an uncongenial world for the sake of individual well-being and also for the health of a collective social harmony. The potential for success was evident in Read's observation that children quite naturally give forth imagery that maintains contact with the deepest levels of social experience, and with times when social cohesion was the normal order.

A corollary, which armed the art teachers and explains the enormous, immediate and continued success of his book was that defects of modern life – injustice, immorality, harsh competition, even war – had roots in prevailing systems of education and, specifically, in an emphasizing of intellectual development to the exclusion of everything else, visited upon children from around the age of 10. Because of this, the infant with inborn access to ancient, collective experience became a rootless 10-year-old and a centre of self-interest. What the authorities considered to be liberal education was nothing more than systematic repression, the elimination of which would give rise to recovery of individual creative fulfilment, mutual communication and collective social health.

These combined objectives and ambitions disseminated rapidly, but outside Read's direct control. While this took place, he readdressed his other great purpose, encouragement of the avant-garde, which he could engage directly because of its finer focus. It was of temporary, but no less vital, importance as he saw that avant-garde enterprise had to retain its effectiveness until such times as its forms of creativity would cease to be exceptional. This was the objective that, as its first president, he projected into the Institute of Contemporary Arts (ICA), when it was established in London in 1947.

The ICA's founding purpose was both propagandist and educational. It brought accomplished artists into contact with those who, as a result, became the next generation of accomplished artists. Ordinary members could tap current creative research at source and effect its dissemination throughout the wider community. It was not a place where art was made, but where the most tentative beginnings of its translation into other forms of thought and action – by exposition, argument and debate – took place.

In effect, it was an echo of Read's own formative experience when, as a young man, the shock of unprecedented abstract images had sent him rushing to philosophy. But now the philosophical context had considerably altered: Jung and D. W. Thompson had influenced the present *Zeitgeist* (Thistlewood, 1982), and theories of collective mind and organic formation were in the air. Artists, by whose efforts the organization of society was to be incrementally changed, needed to be alive to such philosophy, the full range of aesthetic principles which had nurtured it, and its ramifications for a cross-section of human understanding. Thus, the ICA embraced a comprehensive spectrum of avant-garde art, including Abstraction, Surrealism, and every shade or tendency between them (Thistlewood, 1989); and it also provided a forum for advanced scientific philo-

sophy, as well as the latest researches in sociology, anthropology and other disciplines. It was in Read's special sense an 'anarchist' cell, an organic community dedicated to the constant revision and reinvigoration of its essential values, and to the integration of diverse interests meeting in the common sphere of art.

But while Read took direct action in relation to the avant-garde, his general educational philosophy – spread by means of his lecture tours but principally through his writings – affected practices throughout the world. *Education through Art* was translated into over thirty languages and is still regarded as a seminal text in countries as diverse as Egypt, Brazil and Japan. Dissemination relied upon remote conviction, but in the United Kingdom was assisted by the popularization of Read's ideas through cheap pamphlets. In one of these (Read, 1944), he acknowledged his belonging to a tradition first given authoritative shape by Plato, simplified Platonic theory for popular consumption, sketched out a strategy for building an authentic communal culture by perfecting parent/child, teacher/child and individual/group relationships, and argued against the curbing of schools' freedom to determine curricula appropriate to localized circumstances.

Yet there was also within Read's scope a form of direct influence on national and supranational institutions. From 1946 until his death in 1968 he was president of the Society for Education in Art (SEA), the renamed ATG, in which capacity he had a platform for addressing UNESCO. He was extremely welcoming of policies expressed at UNESCO's launching conference in 1946 – policies devoted to the cultivation of worldwide understanding through education, and the elimination of international conflict at the point of its normal origination, mutual ignorance – but he was nevertheless critical of an automatic reliance on conventional modes of education, and a perceived confusion of culture with learning, education with propaganda.

In a lecture at the Museum of Modern Art, New York (timed to coincide with a sitting of the United Nations), he delivered a devastating critique of attempts to prevent war with card-indexes and documentary films (Read, 1948). He argued that UNESCO's desired moral revolution could not be secured by arguments addressed to minds corrupted with individuated intellectualization: a moral revolution required the total reorientation of the human personality, which could only be secured by integrative education. On the basis of such representation Read, with others, succeeded in establishing the International Society for Education through Art (INSEA) as an executive arm of UNESCO in 1954.

No doubt the most compelling argument he proposed to UNESCO was that art provides the best prospect of an international medium of cultural exchange and understanding, for the comparable internationalism of science is always to be confounded by national interests. While almost all other enterprises are intended to address the removal of barriers – of sovereignty, custom, language or trade – the visual arts know no such barriers. They constitute 'a language of symbols that communicates a meaning without hindrance from country to country across the centuries' (Read, 1970, pp. 233-54). This posthumously published

assertion has continued to be the cornerstone of INSEA philosophy until the present day. But it has required of officialdom a remarkable investment in faith, for what Read proposed was not a means of transforming states of mind by propaganda.

Education through art is in effect a reverse propaganda, for it begins with the felt truth which is then expressed as symbol — the feeling finds its equivalent in a plastic image (Read, 1955, pp. 88-89). Images originate in collective experience and create correspondences in shared realities: the social bond is rehearsed and reinforced. That a virtual metaphysics should frame a supranational programme is evidence of its conviction and sincerity.

> So we must begin with small things, in diverse ways, helping one another, discovering one's own peace of mind, waiting for the understanding that flashes from one peaceful mind to another. In that way the separate cells will take shape, will be joined to one another, will manifest new forms of social organization and new types of art. From that multiplicity and diversity, that dynamic interplay and emulation, a new culture may arise, and mankind be united as never before in the consciousness of a common destiny [Read, 1948, p. 15].

References

Benda, J. 1928. *La Trahison des clercs.* Translated into English by Richard Aldington as *The Great Betrayal*, London, Routledge. Also: *Treason of the Intellectuals.* New York, Norton, 1969.

Hulme, T. E. 1924. *Speculations.* (Ed. by Herbert Read.) London, Kegan Paul.

Macdonald, S. 1970. *The History and Philosophy of Art Education.* London, London University Press.

Read, H. 1933. *Art Now.* London, Faber.

——. (ed). 1936. *Surrealism.* London, Faber.

——. 1937. *Art and Society.* London, Heinemann.

——. 1938. *Poetry and Anarchism.* London, Faber.

——. 1940. *Annals of Innocence and Experience.* London, Faber.

——. 1943. *Education through Art.* London, Faber.

——. 1944. *The Education of Free Men.* London, Freedom Press.

——. 1945. *Art and Society.* 2nd ed. London, Faber.

——. 1948. *Culture and Education in a World Order.* New York, Museum of Modern Art.

——. 1952. *The Philosophy of Modern Art.* London, Faber.

——. 1954. *Anarchy and Order.* London, Faber.

——. 1955. *The Grass Roots of Art.* London, Faber.

——. 1968. *The Cult of Sincerity.* London, Faber.

——. 1970. *Redemption of the Robot.* London, Faber.

Richardson, M. 1948. *Art and the Child.* London, London University Press.

Suttie, I. D. 1935. *The Origins of Love and Hate.* London, London University Press.

Thistlewood, D. 1982. 'Organic Art and the Popularization of a Scientific Philosophy.' *British Journal of Aesthetics* (Oxford University Press), Vol. 22, No. 4, pp. 311-21.

——. 1984. *Herbert Read: Formlessness and Form; An Introduction to his Aesthetics.* London, Routledge.

——. 1989. 'The Museum of Modern Art, New York, and the London Institute of Contemporary Arts: A Common Philosophy of Modern Art.' *British Journal of Aesthetics* (Oxford University Press), Vol. 29, No. 4, pp. 316-28.

Thompson, D. W. 1942. *On Growth and Form*. New ed. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Woodcock, G. 1972. *Herbert Read: the Stream and the Source*. London, Faber.

Contributors to this volume

Richard Aldrich (United Kingdom)

Chair of the Department of History, Humanities and Philosophy of the University of London Institute of Education. President of the United Kingdom History of Education Society, and a Director of the General Teaching Council Company (England and Wales). Author of more than fifty publications in the fields of the history of education, educational policy and the teaching of history. Recent examples include two co-authored books: *A Dictionary of British Educationists* (1989); and *Education and Policy in England in the Twentieth Century* (1991); and, as author, *History in the National Curriculum* (1991).

Yuri Alferov (Russian Federation)

Former staff member of the International Bureau of Education (Switzerland) and works at present for the Russian Academy of Education.

Zhecho Atanassov (Bulgaria)

Professor of the History of Education at the Kliment Ohridsky University in Sofia. A researcher on the history of education adopting cultural and philosophical approaches. Among the 600 works on educational theory, textbooks and periodical articles he has published, we may mention *A History of Moral Education* (in Bulgarian, 1986), the Preface to the Bulgarian edition of the works of J. F. Herbart (1990), and *Humanism in Education* (in Bulgarian, 1992).

Jens Bjerg (Denmark)

Senior professor of educational psychology at Roskilde University Centre. Previously worked as a school-teacher, school psychologist and professor at a

teacher-training college. His research and published works have concentrated on educational development and pedagogical theory, particularly regarding educational practice in Denmark. He is currently undertaking research on European education systems and curricular studies.

Abdesselam Cheddadi (Morocco)

Professor in the Faculty of Educational Sciences at the University Muhammad V, Rabat; former Associate Head of Studies at the École des Hautes Études en Sciences Sociales, Paris. Translator of the autobiography of Ibn Khaldūn under the title, *Le voyage d'occident et d'orient* [The Journey to West and East] (1980), extracts from the *Kitab al-'Ibar*, under the title *Peuples et nations du monde* [The World's Peoples and Nations] (2 vols., 1986), and numerous studies on aspects of the thought of Ibn Khaldūn. At present preparing a new translation of the *Muqaddima* and of the *History of the Arabs and Berbers of the Maghrīb* (to be published by Éditions Gallimard, Paris).

Juan Escámez Sánchez (Spain)

Ph.D. Currently professor of the philosophy of education at the University of Valencia and director of the Department of Educational Theory. Formerly an assistant professor at the University of Seville and professor at the University of Murcia. Dean of the Faculty of Philosophy, Psychology and Sciences of Education at the University of Murcia. Twelve Master's dissertations and fifteen doctoral theses have been presented under his direction. He is the author of five books and twenty-eight articles. In recent years he has been working on attitudes, values and moral education.

G. N. Filonov (Russian Federation)

Ph.D. Member of the Academy of Pedagogical Sciences and member of the editorial board of the review *Pedagogika*. For more than twenty years he was a member of UNESCO's International Jury on Literacy Prizes. His numerous publications have been concerned with human beings in a changing world and relations between the individual and society. Recent publications in Russian include *Educating the Pupil's Personality* (1985) and *Educating Citizens at School* (1990).

Nadia Gamāl-al-Dīn (Egypt)

Professor in the principles of education, College of Education, 'Ayn Shams University, Cairo. In 1987, she was awarded the State Prize for the Advancement of the Social Sciences (Education). Her books on education among the Muslims include: *Falsafat al-tarbiya 'Inda Ikhwān al-Safā'* [Philosophy of Education in (the works of) the Brethren of Purity] (1983); *Madaris al-tarbiya fī l-hadara al-*

islāmiyya [Schools of Education in Islamic Civilization] (co-author, 1984). She has also published papers in a number of adult education periodicals, with particular reference to illiteracy among village women. The most recent of these papers was published in *Women and Literacy Development in the Third World*, edited by Eve Malmquist (1992).

Ge Zhengming (China)

Graduate of the Nanjing (Nanking) Institute of Foreign Languages. Pursued a long career as a diplomat, translator and teacher. Currently a member of the Association of Chinese Translators, assistant lecturer in the United States of America as a teacher of English as a second foreign language, co-ordinator of co-operation with foreign countries and head of the External Affairs Bureau at the Chinese Central Institute for Educational Research. Current interests include research on education in antiquity and in modern times. Recent publications include *Ao Hengli* [O. Henry] (1990), *Zhongxiaoxue kexue shiyan 200 li* [200 Examples of Scientific Experiments for Secondary and Primary Schools] (forthcoming), *Yingguo gudai gongye, nongye, jiaoyu jianshi* [A Brief History of Industry, Agriculture and Education in the England of Yesteryear] (1991), and numerous periodical articles.

Peter Gordon (United Kingdom)

Professor of education, with special reference to the history of education, University of London Institute of Education. Formerly one of Her Majesty's Inspectors of Schools. Editor of the Woburn Press 'Education Series' and author of many books, including *The Victorian School Manager* (1974), *Selection for Secondary Education* (1980), *The Study of Education: A Collection of Inaugural Lectures* (3 vols., 1980-88), and *A Dictionary of British Educationists* (1989) with R. Aldrich.

Charles Hummel (Switzerland)

Studied philosophy at the Universities of Basle (with Karl Jaspers), Rome and Zurich. Permanent Delegate of Switzerland to UNESCO, 1970-87. Member of the Executive Board of UNESCO. Member and President of the Council of the International Bureau of Education. Representative of Switzerland on the Council for Cultural Co-operation (Council of Europe). Ambassador to Ireland, 1987-92. Author of *Nicolas de Cuse* and *Education Today for the World of Tomorrow*, as well as numerous articles on philosophical and educational topics.

A. R. Kamat (India)

Honorary professor at the Indian Institute of Education, Kothrud, Pune.

Yusuf Kassam (United Republic of Tanzania)

Senior associate/consultant, E. T. Jackson & Associates, Ottawa, Canada. Formerly director of programmes for the International Council for Adult Education, Toronto; Associate professor of adult education at the University of Dar es Salaam (1970-79); and director of the Institute of Adult Education (1979-81), United Republic of Tanzania. His fields of competence include literacy, adult education and participatory research. Author of *The Adult Education Revolution in Tanzania* and co-editor of *Participatory Research: An Emerging Alternative Methodology in Social Science Research.*

Mahmoud Kombar (Egypt)

Received his Ph.D. at the Sorbonne in Paris. At present professor and chairman of the Department of Foundations of Education, University of Qatar. Author of: *Studies in Islamic Education* (3 vols.); *Adult Education: Concepts, Forms and Arab Experiments; Education and Enlightening Society; Studies in the Foundations of Education;* and numerous other studies. Taught at the al-Noqrashi Model School in 1957 and 1958.

Tadeusz Lewowicki (Poland)

Ph.D. Professor of general education at Warsaw University and former dean of the Faculty of Education, Warsaw University, 1977-81. Deputy director of the Institute for Scientific Policy in Higher Education, 1981-85, director of the Institute for Educational Research, 1985-89 and vice-chairman of the Committee of Experts for National Education. Editor of *Ruch Pedagogiczny* [The Educational Movement] and author of about 300 publications, including *Aspiracje dzieci i młodzieży* [Aspirations of Children and Young People] (1987) and *Proces kształcenia w szkole wyższej* [The Educational Process at the Secondary School].

Isabel Monal (Cuba)

Researcher at the Institute of Philosophy of the Academy of Science and Professor of Philosophy at the University of Havana. She has held many responsible posts in Cuban academic and cultural life, and spent several years working at UNESCO as a programme specialist. Her main research work and publications concern the history of ideas, particularly in Latin America, such as *Cuatro intentos interpretativos: Las ideas en la América Latina* [Four Attempts at Interpretation: Ideas in Latin America]; *Filosofía e ideología en Cuba (siglo XIX)* [Philosophy and Ideology in Cuba (Nineteenth Century)].

Alberto Munari (Switzerland)

Psychologist and epistemologist, professor at the University of Geneva where, since 1974, he has been running the Unit of Educational Psychology. From 1964 to 1974 he collaborated with Jean Piaget and, under his tutelage, obtained his doctorate in experimental genetic psychology in 1971. He is the author of numerous publications, including *The Piagetian Approach to the Scientific Method: Implications for Teaching; La scuola di Ginebra dopo Piaget* [The Geneva School since Piaget]; and the recent (1993) *Il sapere ritrovato: conoscenza, formazione, organizzazione* [Knowledge Rediscovered: Acquisition, Training, Organization].

Ricardo Nassif (Argentina)

Professor at the Universities of Tucumán and La Plata before joining the staff of UNESCO. Author of numerous works, among which we may mention *Dewey: su pensamiento pedagógico* [Dewey: His Educational Thought] (1968), *Spranger: su pensamiento pedagógico* [Spranger: His Educational Thought] (1968) and *Teoría de la educación* [Educational Theory] (1980). His educational interests were directed towards the theory of education adapted to the Latin American situation. He died in 1984.

Hermann Röhrs (Germany)

Historian and comparative educationist. Former head of the Education Department, University of Mannheim, former director of the Institute of Education, University of Heidelberg, and of the Heidelberg Research Centre for Comparative Education; Professor Emeritus since 1984. Honorary doctorate from Aristoteles University, Thessalonika (Greece), 1991. Author of several books on history and comparative education, including *Tradition and Reform of the University under an International Perspective* (1987) and *Vocational and General Education in Western Industrial Societies* (1988). Apart from English, his books have been translated into Greek, Italian, Japanese and Korean.

Jean-François Saffange (France)

Ph.D. in the educational sciences. Professor in charge of complementary courses in the Department of Educational Sciences at the University of Lyon II. Author of *Libres Regards sur Summerhill* [An Unbiased Look at Summerhill] (Preface by Daniel Hameline, 1985).

Mihail S. Skatkin (Russian Federation)

Ph.D. Professor of the educational sciences and member of the Academy of Pedagogical Sciences. Worked for many years at the Institute of Theoretical Education on subjects ranging from curriculum construction to the school of the future; a member of the institute's scientific council. Author of several publications, including textbooks for students in teacher-training institutions, particularly *Teaching Methods for Secondary School: Some Problems of Modern Teaching* (1982, in Russian).

Michel Soëtard (France)

Ph.D. in arts and human sciences. Professor of the history of educational thought and educational philosophy at the Institute of Educational Sciences, Université Catholique de l'Ouest, Angers. Director of research at the University Lumière, Lyon II. Author of *Pestalozzi ou la naissance de l'éducateur* [Pestalozzi or the Birth of the Educator] (1981), and of books on *Pestalozzi* (1987), *Rousseau* (1988) and *Fröbel* (1990). He has been involved in the preparation of several books and dictionaries, and has contributed numerous articles to French, German, Italian and Swiss periodicals on the history of education and on present-day problems. Invited professor at the universities of Würzburg and Padua. Member of the Council of the World Association for Educational Research (WAER) and of the Executive Committee of the Institut pour la Formation Européenne (ISFE), and secretary-general of the Association Française d'Éducation Comparée (AFEC).

David Thistlewood (United Kingdom)

Reader in the history of art and architecture at the University of Liverpool. Editor of the *Journal of Art and Design Education*. Past president of the National Society for Education in Art and Design and chair of the Board of Trustees of the National Arts Education Archive. He is editor of the following recent publications: *Critical Studies in Art and Design Education; Issues in Design Education; Histories of Art and Design Education: Cole to Coldstream;* and *Drawing Research and Development.*

Jandhyala B. G. Tilak (India)

Senior fellow and head of the Educational Finance Unit at the National Institute of Educational Planning. His publications include *Economics of Inequality in Education* (1987), *Educational Finances in South Asia* (1988), *Educational Planning at Grassroots* (1992), and *Education for Development in Asia* (1993). He has also taught at the Universities of Delhi and Virginia, and worked at the World Bank.

Georgij S. Tsov'janov (Russian Federation)

Candidate in educational sciences at the Academy of Pedagogical Sciences.

Keith Watson (United Kingdom)

Professor of education at Reading University, where he is director of the Centre for International Studies in Education, Management and Training. He spent many years with the British Council in Poland, Bangladesh, Thailand and London, before joining the university. His main research papers are on comparative and international education. His published works include: *Educational Development in Thailand* and *Education in the Third World*. He is chief editor of the *International Journal of Educational Development*.

Ruth Watts (United Kingdom)

Lecturer in education responsible for the training of history teachers and for post-graduate courses in the teaching of history at the University of Birmingham. Author of numerous articles and book chapters on the Unitarian contribution to education in England, on women's educational history and on the teaching of history.

Gérard Wormser (France)

Responsible for philosophy and the social sciences for *Éditions Encyclopaedia Universalis* and senior lecturer at the Institut d'Études Politiques, Paris. His research is more especially concerned with the question of judgement in phenomenology – from Husserl to Sartre and Merleau-Ponty. Author of a number of articles on Montaigne.

Zhuo Qingjun (China)

Director of China National Institute for Educational Research. Her more recent works are: *Survey of Reform in China: Education* (1992); *Moral Education and Theory and Practice* (1992); *Educational Reform at Junior Middle Schools*. Her thesis, *Training cum Production in China*, was issued by the Centre for the Study of Education in Developing Countries (CESO) in 1992. She has also contributed to several educational journals.

Thinkers on education in this series

ALAIN *Philippe FORAY (France)*
Institut universitaire de formation des maîtres, Lyon (France)
ARISTOTLE *Charles HUMMEL (Switzerland)*
Former President, Council of the International Bureau of Education, Geneva (Switzerland)
AVICENNA (Ibn Sīnā) *'Abd al-Rahmān AL-NAQĪB (Egypt)*
Mansoura University (Egypt)
Andrés BELLO *Gregorio WEINBERG (Argentina)*
University of Buenos Aires (Argentina)
Bruno BETTELHEIM *Karen ZELAN (United States of America)*
The New School for Psychoanalysis, San Francisco (United States of America)
Alfred BINET *René ZAZZO (France)*
Ecole pratique des hautes études en sciences sociales, Paris (France)
Pavel Petrovitch BLONSKY *Mihail Gerasimovich DANILCHENKO (Russian Federation)*
Teacher Training University, Moscow (Russian Federation)
Boutros Al-BOUSTĀNĪ *Khalīl ABOU-RJAILĪ (Lebanon)*
Ministry of National Education (Lebanon)
Martin BUBER *Kalman YARON (Israel)*
Hebrew University of Jerusalem (Israel)
CAI YUANPEI *ZHANG Lizhong (China)*
La Trobe University (Australia)
Édouard CLAPARÈDE *Daniel HAMELINE (France)*
University of Geneva and Institut Jean-Jacques Rousseau (Switzerland)
COMENIUS *Jean PIAGET (Switzerland)*
Formerly Director of the International Bureau of Education, Geneva (Switzerland)
CONDORCET *Bernard JOLIBERT (France)*
University of Réunion (France)
CONFUCIUS *YANG Huanyin (China)*
Central Institute of Educational Sciences, Beijing (China)
Roger COUSINET *Louis RAILLON (France)*
Former Director, 'Education et développement', Paris (France)
Jan Władysław DAWID *Czesław KUPISIEWICZ (Poland)*
Warsaw University (Poland)

Jean-Ovide DECROLY *Francine DUBREUCQ (Belgium)*
Centre for Decrolian Studies, Brussels (Belgium)
John DEWEY *Robert B. WESTBROOK (United States of America)*
University of Rochester, New York (United States of America)
Friedrich Adolph Wilhelm DIESTERWEG *Karl-Heinz GÜNTHER (Germany)*
Former Chairman, Commission on the History of Education and the School in Germany
Émile DURKHEIM *Jean-Claude FILLOUX (France)*
University of Paris X (France)
József EÖTVÖS *István MÉSZÁROS (Hungary)*
Eötvös Loránd University (Hungary)
ERASMUS *Jean-Claude MARGOLIN (France)*
University of Tours (France)
Al-FĀRĀBĪ *'Ammār AL-TĀLBĪ (Algeria)*
University of Qatar (Qatar)
Adolphe FERRIÈRE *Daniel HAMELINE (France)*
University of Geneva and Institut Jean-Jacques Rousseau (Switzerland)
Célestin FREINET *Louis LEGRAND (France)*
Louis Pasteur University, Strasbourg (France)
Paulo FREIRE *Heinz-Peter GERHARDT (Germany)*
Frankfurt University (Germany); visiting professor at the University of Rio Grande do Norte (Brazil)
Sigmund FREUD *Bernard JOLIBERT (France)*
University of Réunion (France)
Friedrich FRÖBEL *Helmut HEILAND (Germany)*
Duisburg University (Germany)
FUKUZAWA Yukichi *NISHIKAWA Shunsaku (Japan)*
Fukuzawa Memorial Centre for Modern Japanese Studies, Keio University, Tokyo (Japan)
Mohandas Karamchand GANDHI *Krishna KUMAR (India)*
University of Delhi (India)
A. MATHEW (India)
National Institute of Adult Education, Delhi (India)
Al-GHAZĀLĪ *Nabil NOFAL (Egypt)*
UNESCO Regional Co-ordinating Unit of the Educational Innovation Programme for Development in the Arab States, Amman (Jordan)
Francisco GINER DE LOS RÍOS *Julio RUIZ BERRIO (Spain)*
Complutense University of Madrid (Spain)
Dimitri GLINOS *Marie ELIOU (Greece)*
University of Athens (Greece)
Paul GOODMAN *Edgar Z. FRIEDENBERG (United States)*
Former Professor at Dalhousie University, Halifax (Canada)
Antonio GRAMSCI *Attilio MONASTA (Italy)*
University of Florence (Italy)
N. F. S. GRUNDTVIG *Max LAWSON (Australia)*
University of New England, Armidale (Australia)
Maria GRZEGORZEWSKA *Alicja SIEMAK-TYLIKOWSKA (Poland)*
University of Warsaw (Poland)
Georg HEGEL *Jürgen-Eckardt PLEINES (Germany)*
Karlsruhe University (Germany)
Johann Friedrich HERBART *Norbert HILGENHEGER (Germany)*
University of Cologne (Germany)

Wilhelm von HUMBOLDT *Gerd HOHENDORF (Germany)*
Dresden University (Germany)
Torsten HUSÉN *T. Neville POSTLETHWAITE (United Kingdom)*
Hamburg University (Germany)
Tāhā HUSSEIN *'Abdel Fattah GALĀL (Egypt)*
National Centre for Educational Research Development, Cairo (Egypt)
Ivan ILLICH *Marcela GAJARDO (Chile)*
Latin American Faculty of Social Science (FLACSO), Santiago (Chile)
Karl JASPERS *Hermann HORN (Germany)*
Dortmund University (Germany)
Gaspar Melchor de JOVELLANOS *Angeles GALINO CARRILLO (Spain)*
Complutense University of Madrid (Spain)
Marc-Antoine JULLIEN DE PARIS *Jacqueline GAUTHERIN (France)*
University of Nantes (France)
Isaac Leon KANDEL *Erwin POLLACK (United States of America)*
Kennedy-King College, Chicago (United States of America)
Immanuel KANT *Heinrich KANZ (Germany)*
Rheinische Friedrich-Wilhelms University, Bonn (Germany)
Georg KERSCHENSTEINER *Hermann RÖHRS (Germany)*
Heidelberg University (Germany)
Ellen KEY *Thorbjörn LENGBORN (Sweden)*
Stockholm University (Sweden)
Ibn KHALDŪN *Abdelsselam CHEDDADI (Morocco)*
Mohamed V University, Rabat (Morocco)
Christen Mikkelsen KOLD *Jens BJERG (Denmark)*
Roskilde University Centre, Roskilde (Denmark)
Janusz KORCZAK *Tadeusz LEWOWICKI (Poland)*
University of Warsaw (Poland)
Nadezhda Konstantinovna KRUPSKAYA
Mihail S. SKATKIN (Russian Federation)
Academy of Pedagogical Sciences, Moscow (Russian Federation)
Georgij S. TSOV'JANOV (Russian Federation)
Academy of Pedagogical Sciences, Moscow (Russian Federation)
Yuri ALFEROV (Russian Federation)
Russian Academy of Education (Russian Federation)
John LOCKE *Richard ALDRICH (United Kingdom)*
University of London (United Kingdom)
Anton MAKARENKO *G. N. FILONOV (Russian Federation)*
Academy of Pedagogical Sciences, Moscow (Russian Federation)
Yuri ALFEROV (Russian Federation)
Russian Academy of Education (Russian Federation)
MAO Zedong *ZHUO Qingjun (China)*
China National Institute of Educational Research, Beijing (China)
José MARTÍ *Ricardo NASSIF (Argentina)*
Professor at the Universities of Tucumán and La Plata (Argentina)
Isabel MONAL (Cuba)
UNESCO Regional Office for Culture in Latin America and the Caribbean, Havana (Cuba)
MENCIUS *GE Zhengming (China)*
China National Institute of Educational Research, Beijing (China)
MISKAWAYH *Nadia GAMĀL AL-DĪN (Egypt)*
'Ayn al-Shams University, Cairo (Egypt)

Michel de MONTAIGNE *Gérard WORMSER (France)*
Institute for Political Studies, Paris (France)
Maria MONTESSORI *Hermann RÖHRS (Germany)*
Heidelberg University (Germany)
Sir Thomas MORE *Keith WATSON (United Kingdom)*
University of Reading (United Kingdom)
J. P. NAIK *A. R. KAMAT (India)*
Indian Institute of Education, Kothrud, Pune (India)
Jandhyala B. G. TILAK (India)
National Institute of Educational Planning and Administration, New Delhi (India)
Alexander Sutherland NEILL *Jean-François SAFFANGE (France)*
University of Lyon II (France)
Peter NOIKOV *Zhecho ATANASSOV (Bulgaria)*
Kliment Ohridsky University, Sofia (Bulgaria)
Julius Kambarage NYERERE *Yusuf KASSAM (United Republic of Tanzania)*
E. T. Jackson & Associates, Ottawa (Canada)
José ORTEGA Y GASSET *Juan ESCÁMEZ SÁNCHEZ (Spain)*
University of Valencia (Spain)
Robert OWEN *Peter GORDON (United Kingdom)*
University of London (United Kingdom)
Johann Heinrich PESTALOZZI *Michel SOËTARD (France)*
Catholic University of the West, Angers, and University of Lyon II (France)
Jean PIAGET *Alberto MUNARI (Switzerland)*
University of Geneva (Switzerland)
PLATO *Charles HUMMEL (Switzerland)*
Former President, Council of the International Bureau of Education, Geneva (Switzerland)
Joseph PRIESTLEY *Ruth WATTS (United Kingdom)*
University of Birmingham (United Kingdom)
Isma'il Al-QABBĀNĪ *Mahmud KOMBAR (Egypt)*
University of Qatar (Qatar)
Herbert READ *David THISTLEWOOD (United Kingdom)*
University of Liverpool (United Kingdom)
Carl ROGERS *Fred ZIMRING (United States of America)*
Case Western Reserve University, Cleveland, Ohio (United States)
Jean-Jacques ROUSSEAU *Michel SOËTARD (France)*
Catholic University of the West, Angers, and University of Lyon II (France)
Torsten RUDENSCHÖLD *Gunnar RICHARDSON (Sweden)*
Linköping University (Sweden)
Michael Ernest SADLER *James Henry HIGGINSON (United Kingdom)*
Formerly Warden of Sadler Hall, University of Leeds (United Kingdom)
Otto SALOMON *Hans THORBJÖRNSSON (Sweden)*
Linköping University (Sweden)
Domingo Faustino SARMIENTO *Héctor Félix BRAVO (Argentina)*
University of Buenos Aires (Argentina)
António SÉRGIO *António NÓVOA (Portugal)*
University of Lisbon (Portugal)
B. F. SKINNER *Louis M. SMITH (United States of America)*
Washington University, St. Louis, Missouri (United States of America)
Herbert SPENCER *Brian HOLMES (United Kingdom)*
University of London (United Kingdom)

Rudolf STEINER *Heiner ULLRICH (Germany)*
Mainz University (Germany)
Bogdan SUCHODOLSKI *Irena WOJNAR (Poland)*
University of Warsaw (Poland)
SUN Yat-sen *ZHANG Lanxin (China)*
China National Institute of Educational Research, Beijing (China)
Rabindranath TAGORE *Narmadeshwar JHA (India)*
Former Vice-Chancellor of the University of Bihar (India)
Rifā'a AL-TAHTĀWĪ *'Saïd Ismaïl 'ĀLĪ (Egypt)*
Kuwait University (Kuwait)
Leo TOLSTOY *Semion Filippovitch YEGOROV (Russian Federation)*
Academy of Pedagogical Sciences, Moscow (Russian Federation)
Ágoston TREFORT *Istvánné KISS (Hungary)*
Eötvos Loránd University, Budapest (Hungary)
Davorin TRSTENJAK *Nedjeljko KUJUNDŽIĆ (Croatia)*
University of Zagreb (Croatia)
Konstantin Dmitrievitch USHINSKY *Miroslav CIPRO (Czech Republic)*
Charles University, Prague (Czech Republic)
Dmitry UZNADZE *Georgy Nikolaevich KETCHUASHVILI (Georgia)*
Tbilisi State University (Georgia)
José Pedro VARELA *Marta DEMARCHI (Uruguay)*
University of the Republic, Montevideo (Uruguay)
Hugo RODRÍGUEZ (Uruguay)
Teacher Training Institute, Montevideo (Uruguay)
José VASCONCELOS *Rosario ENCINAS (Mexico)*
National Institute of Adult Education, Mexico City (Mexico)
Federico von BORSTEL (United States of America)
Fundación José Vasconcelos, Poway, California (United States of America)
Giambattista VICO *Maria Teresa MAIULLARI (Italy)*
The Luigi Einaudi Foundation, Turin (Italy)
Lev S. VYGOTSKY *Ivan IVIĆ (Yugoslavia)*
University of Belgrade (Yugoslavia)
Dijana PLUT (Yugoslavia)
University of Belgrade (Yugoslavia)
Juan Luis VIVES *Ricardo MARÍN IBÁÑEZ (Spain)*
National Pedagogical University, Valencia, and National University for Distance Education, Madrid (Spain)
Henri WALLON *Hélène GRATIOT ALPHANDERY (France)*
Former Professor at the University of Paris V and the Ecole pratique des hautes études en sciences sociales, Paris (France)

To place your subscription **prospects**

To place your subscription to *Prospects'* Arabic, English, French or Spanish editions, complete one of the order forms below. Post it, with a cheque or money order in your national currency, to your national distributor, who is listed at the end of this review. (For the subscription price in your currency, consult your national distributor.)

You may also send the order form to: Service abonnements, PROPUBLIC, B.P. 1, 59440 Avesnes-sur-Helpe, France (tel: 27.61.32.42; fax: 27.61.22.52), accompanied by payment in the form of (a) a cheque in French francs made out to UNESCO; (b) an international money order in French francs made out to UNESCO, Subscription Service; or (c) UNESCO international book coupons for the equivalent amount.

To my national distributor (or Service abonnements, PROPUBLIC, B.P. 1, 59440 Avesnes-sur-Helpe, France). Please enter my subscription (4 numbers per year) to *Prospects, Quarterly Review of Education.*

Annual subscription rates:

- ☐ Arabic edition
- ☐ English edition
- ☐ French edition
- ☐ Spanish edition

- ☐ Institutions: 150 F
- ☐ Individuals: 125 F
- ☐ Institutions in developing countries: 125 F
- ☐ Individuals in developing countries: 110 F

The sum of _____ is enclosed in payment.

(For the price in your national currency, consult your national distributor.)

Name _____

Address _____

_____

(Please type or print clearly)

Signature

To my national distributor (or Service abonnements, PROPUBLIC, B.P. 1, 59440 Avesnes-sur-Helpe, France). Please enter my subscription (4 numbers per year) to *Prospects, Quarterly Review of Education.*

Annual subscription rates:

- ☐ Arabic edition
- ☐ English edition
- ☐ French edition
- ☐ Spanish edition

- ☐ Institutions: 150 F
- ☐ Individuals: 125 F
- ☐ Institutions in developing countries: 125 F
- ☐ Individuals in developing countries: 110 F

The sum of _____ is enclosed in payment.

(For the price in your national currency, consult your national distributor.)

Name _____

Address _____

_____

(Please type or print clearly)

Signature

National distributors of UNESCO publications

ALBANIA: 'Ndermarrja e perhapjes se librit', TIRANA.

ANGOLA: Distribuidora Livros e Publicações, Caixa postal 2848, LUANDA.

ANTIGUA AND BARBUDA: National Commission of Antigua and Barbuda, c/o Ministry of Education, Church Street, ST JOHNS, Antigua.

ARGENTINA: Librería "El Correo de la UNESCO", EDIIYR S.R.L., Tucumán 1685, 1050 BUENOS AIRES, tel.: 40 05 12, 40 85 94, fax. (541) 956 19 85

AUSTRALIA: Educational Supplies Pty Ltd. P.O Box 33, Brookvale 2100, N.S.W., fax: (612) 905 52 09; **Hunter Publications,** 58A Gipps Street, COLLINGWOOD, Victoria 3066, tel.: (613) 417 53 61, fax: (3) 419 71 54; Gray International Booksellers, 3/12 Sir Thomas Mitchell Road, Bondi Beach, New South Wales 2026, tel./fax: (61-2) 30 41 16. *For scientific maps and atlases*: Australian Mineral Foundation Inc., 63 Conyngham Street, GLENSIDE, South Australia 5065, tel.: (618) 379 04 44, fax: (618) 379 46 34

AUSTRIA: Gerold & Co., Graben 31, A-1011 WIEN, tel.: 55 35 01 40, fax: 512 47 31 29.

BAHRAIN: United Schools International, P.O. Box 726, BAHRAIN, tel.: (973) 23 25 76, fax: (973) 27 22 52

BANGLADESH: Karim International, G.P.O. Box 2141, 64/1 Monipuri Para, Tejgaon, Farmgate, DHAKA 1215, tel.. 32 97 05, fax. (880-2) 81 61 69.

BARBADOS: University of the West Indies Bookshop, Cave Hill Campus, P.O Box 64, BRIDGETOWN, tel.: 424 54 76, fax: (809) 425 13 27.

BELGIUM: Jean De Lannoy, Avenue du Roi 202, 1060 BRUXELLES, tel.: 538 51 69, 538 43 08, fax: 538 08 41.

BOTSWANA: Botswana Book Centre, P.O. Box 91, GABORONE

BRAZIL: Fundação Getúlio Vargas, Editora, Diviso de Vendas, Caixa postal 9.052-ZC-02, Praia de Botafogo 188, 22253-900 RIO DE JANEIRO (RJ), tel.: (21) 551 52 45, fax. (5521) 551 78 01; **Livraria Nobel, S.A.,** Divisao Biblioteca, R. Maria Antonia, 108, 01222-010 SÃO PAULO (SP), tel.: 257 21 44/876 28 22, fax: (55-11) 257 21 44/876 69 88.

CAMEROON: Commission nationale de la République du Cameroun pour l'UNESCO, B.P. 1600, YAOUNDE; **Librairie des Éditions Clé,** B.P 1501, YAOUNDÉ.

CANADA: Renouf Publishing Company Ltd, 1294 Algoma Road, OTTAWA, Ont. K1B 3W8, tel.: (613) 741-4333, fax: (613) 741-5439 *Bookshops.* 61 Sparks Street, OTTAWA, *and* 211 Yonge Street, TORONTO. *Sales office*: 7575 Trans Canada Hwy, Ste 305, ST LAURENT, Quebec H4T 1V6.

CHINA: China National Publications Import and Export Corporation, 16 Gongti E. Road, Chaoyang District, P.O. Box 88, BEIJING, 100704, tel : (01) 506 6688, fax: (861) 506 3101.

CROATIA: Mladost, Ilica 30/11, ZAGREB

CYPRUS: 'MAM', Archbishop Makarios 3rd Avenue, P.O. Box 1722, NICOSIA.

CZECH REPUBLIC: SNTL, Spalena 51, 113-02 Praha 1, **Artia Pegas Press Ltd,** Palac Metro, Narodni trida 25, 110-00 PRAHA 1; **INTES-PRAHA,** Slavy Hornika 1021, 15006 PRAHA 5, tel.: (422) 522 449, fax. (422) 522 449, 522 443

DENMARK: Munksgaard Book and Subscription Service, P.O. Box 2148, DK-1016, KØBENHAVN K, tel.: 33 12 85 70, fax: 33 12 93 87.

EGYPT: UNESCO Publications Centre, 1 Talaat Harb Street, CAIRO, fax: (202) 392 25 66; **Al-Ahram Distribution Agency,** Marketing Dept., Al-Ahram New Building, Galaa Street, CAIRO, tel.: 578 60 69, fax: (20-2) 578 60 23, 578 68 33, *and* Al-Ahram Bookshops: Opera Square, CAIRO, Al-Bustan Center, Bab El-Look, CAIRO.

EL SALVADOR: Clásicos Roxsil, 4a. Av. Sur 2-3, SANTA TECLA, tel.: (50-3) 28 12 12, 28 18 32, fax: (50-3) 28 32 00

ETHIOPIA: Ethiopian National Agency for UNESCO, P.O. Box 2996, ADDIS ABABA.

FINLAND: Akateeminen Kirjakauppa, Keskuskatu 1, SF-00101 HELSINKI 10, tel.: (358) 01 21 41, fax: (358) 01 21 44 41; **Suomalainen Kirjakauppa OY,** Koivuvaarankuja 2, SF-01640 VANTAA 64, tel : (358) 08 52 751, fax: (358) 085-27888.

FRANCE: University bookshops and UNESCO Bookshop, UNESCO, 7, place de Fontenoy, 75352 PARIS 07 SP, tel : (1) 45 68 22 22. *Mail orders:* Promotion and Sales Division, **UNESCO Publishing,** UNESCO, 7, place de Fontenoy, 75352 PARIS 07 SP, fax: (1) 42 73 30 07, telex: 204461 Paris. *For periodicals*: Subscription Service, UNESCO, 1, rue Miollis, 75732 PARIS Cedex 15, tel.. (1) 45 68 45 64/65/66, fax: (1) 42 73 30 07, telex: 204461 Paris.

GERMANY: UNO-Verlag, Poppelsdorfer Allee 55, D-53115 BONN 1, tel: (0228) 21 29 40, fax: (0228) 21 74 91; **S. Karger GmbH,** Abt. Buchhandlung, Lorracher Strasse 16A, D-W 7800 FRLIBURG, tel.: (0761) 45 20 70, fax: (0761) 452 07 14; **LKG mbH,** Abt. Internationaler Fachbuchversand, Prager Strasse 16, D-O 7010 LEIPZIG. *For scientific maps*: **Internationales Landkartenhaus GeoCenter,** Schockenriedstr. 44, Postfach 800830, D-70565 STUTTGART, tel.: (0711) 788 93 40, fax: (0711) 788 93 54. For *'The UNESCO Courier'*: **Deutscher UNESCO-Vertrieb,** Basaltstrasse 57, D-W 5300 BONN 3.

GHANA: Presbyterian Bookshop Depot Ltd, P.O. Box 195, ACCRA; **Ghana Book Suppliers Ltd,** P.O. Box 7869, ACCRA; **The University Bookshop of Ghana, Accra: The University Bookshop of Cape Coast; The University Bookshop of Legon,** P.O. Box 1, LEGON.

GREECE: Eleftheroudakis, Nikkis Street 4, ATHENS, tel : (01) 3222-255, fax: (01) 323 98 21, **H. Kauffmann,** 28 rue du Stade, ATHENS, tel.: (03) 322 21 60, (03) 325 53 21, (03) 323 25 45; **Greek National Commission for UNESCO,** 3 Akadimias Street, ATHENS; **John Mihalopoulos & Son S.A.,** 75 Hermou Street, P.O. Box 73, THESSALONIKI, tel.: (01) 3222-255, fax: (01) 323 98 21.

GUINEA-BISSAU: Instituto Nacional do Livro e do Disco, Conselho Nacional da Cultura, Avenida Domingos Ramos n.° 10-A, B.P. 104, BISSAU.

HONG KONG: Swindon Book Co., 13–15 Lock Road, KOWLOON, tel.: 366 80 01, 367 87 89, fax: (852) 739 49 75.

HUNGARY: Librorade KFT, Pesti UT 237, 1173 BUDAPEST

ICELAND: Bokabud, Mals & Menningar, Laugavegi 18, 101 REYKJAVIK, tel.: (354-1) 242 42, fax: (354-1) 62 35 23.

INDIA: UNESCO Regional Office, 8, Poorvi Marg, Vasant Vihar, NEW DELHI 110057, tel.: (91-11) 67 73 10, 67 63 08, fax: (91-11) 687 33 51; **Oxford Book & Stationery Co.,** Scindia House, NEW DELHI 110001, tel.. (91-11) 331 58 96, 331 53 08, fax: (91-11) 332 26 39; **UBS Publishers Distributors Ltd,** 5 Ansari Road, P.O. Box 7015, NEW DELHI 110002, fax: (91-11) 327 65 93; **The Bookpoint (India) Limited,** 3-6-272, Himayatnagar, HYDERABAD 500 029, AP, tel.: 23 21 38, fax: (91-40) 24 03 93, *and* **The Bookpoint (India) Limited,** Kamani Marg, Ballard Estate, BOMBAY 400 038, Maharashtra, tel.: 261 19 72.

INDONESIA: PT Bhratara Niaga Media, Jalan. Oto Iskandardinata III/29, JAKARTA 13340, tel./fax: (6221) 81 91 858; **Indira P.T.**, P.O. Box 181, Jl. Dr Sam Ratulangi 37, JAKARTA PUSAT, tel./fax: (6221) 629 77 42.

IRAN, ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF: Iranian National Commission for UNESCO, Shahid Eslamieh Bldg, 1188 Enghelab Avenue, P.O. Box 11365-4498, TEHRAN 13158, tel. (9821) 640 83 55, fax: (9821) 646 83 67.

IRELAND: TDC Publishers, 28 Hardwicke Street, DUBLIN 1, tel · 74 48 35, 72 62 21, fax: 74 84 16; **Educational Company of Ireland Ltd**, P.O. Box 43A, Walkinstown, DUBLIN 12.

ISRAEL: Steimatzky Ltd, 11 Hakishon Street, P.O. Box 1444, BNEI BRAK 51114, tel.: (972-3) 579 45 79, fax: (9723) 579 45 67; **R.O.Y. International**, 31 Habarzel Street, 3rd floor, Ramat Hayal, TEL AVIV 69710 (postal address. P.O Box 13056, TEL AVIV 61130), tel.: (9723) 49 78 02, fax: (9723) 49 78 12.

ITALY: LICOSA (Libreria Commissionaria Sansoni S.p.A.), via Duca di Calabria, 1/1, 50125 FIRENZE, tel.. (055) 64 54 15, fax. (055) 64 12 57; via Bartolini 29, 20155 MILANO; **FAO Bookshop**, via delle Terme di Caracalla, 00100 ROMA, tel : 57 97 46 08, fax: 578 26 10; **ILO Bookshop**, Corso Unita d'Italia 125, 10127 TORINO, tel · (011) 69 361, fax. (011) 63 88 42.

JAMAICA: University of the West Indies Bookshop, Mona, KINGSTON 7, tel.: (809) 927 16 60-9, ext. 2269 *and* 2325, fax: (809) 997 40 32.

JAPAN: Eastern Book Service Inc., 3-13 Hongo 3-chome, Bunkyo-ku, TOKYO 113, tel (03) 3818-0861, fax. (03) 3818-0864.

JORDAN: Jordan Distribution Agency, P.O. Box 375, AMMAN, tel · 63 01 91, fax: (9626) 63 51 52; **Jordan Book Centre Co. Ltd**, P.O. Box 301, Al-Jubeiha, AMMAN, tel : 67 68 82, 60 68 82, fax· (9626) 60 20 16.

KENYA: Africa Book Services Ltd, Quran House, Mfangano Street, P.O. Box 45245, NAIROBI; Inter-Africa Book Distributors Ltd, Kencom House, 1st Floor, Moi Avenue, P.O. Box 73580, Nairobi.

KOREA, REPUBLIC OF: Korean National Commission for UNESCO, P.O. Box Central 64, 100-600 SEOUL, tel.: 776 39 50/47 54, fax: (822) 568 74 54, *street address*: Sung Won Building, 10th Floor, 141, SamSung-Dong, KangNam-Ku, 135-090 SEOUL.

KUWAIT: The Kuwait Bookshop Co. Ltd, Al Muthanna Complex, Fahed El-Salem Street, P.O Box 2942, Safat 13030, KUWAIT, tel. (965) 242 42 66, 242 46 87, fax: (965) 242 05 58.

LESOTHO: Mazenod Book Centre, P.O. Box 39, MAZENOD 160

LIBERIA: National Bookstore, Mechlin and Carey Streets, P.O Box 590, MONROVIA; **Cole & Yancy Bookshops Ltd**, P.O. Box 286, MONROVIA.

MALAWI: Malawi Book Service, Head Office, P.O. Box 30044, Chichiri, BLANTYRE 3.

MALAYSIA: University of Malaya Co-operative Bookshop, P.O. Box 1127, Jalan Pantai Bahru, 59700 KUALA LUMPUR, fax: (603) 755 44 24; **Mawaddah Enterprise Sdr. Brd.**, 75, Jalan Kapitan Tam Yeong, SEREMBAN 7000, N. Sembilan, tel.: (606) 71 10 62, fax· (606) 73 30 62.

MALDIVES: Asrafee Bookshop, 1/49 Orchid Magu, MALE

MALTA: L. Sapienza & Sons Ltd, 26 Republic Street, VALLETTA.

MAURITIUS: Nalanda Co. Ltd, 30 Bourbon Street, PORT-LOUIS.

MEXICO: Correo de la UNESCO S.A., Guanajuato n ° 72, Col. Roma, C.P. 06700, Deleg. Cuauhtémoc, MEXICO D.F., tel.: 574 75 79, fax: (525) 264 09 19; **Librería Secur**, Av. Carlos Pellicer Cámara s/n, Zona CICOM, 86090 Villahermosa, TABASCO, tel · (93) 12 39 66, fax: (5293) 12 74 80/13 47 65.

MOZAMBIQUE: Instituto National do Livro e do Disco (INLD), Avenida 24 de Julho, n.° 1927, r/c, *and* n.° 1921, 1.° andar, MAPUTO.

MYANMAR: Trade Corporation No. (9), 550–552 Merchant Street, RANGOON.

NEPAL: Sajha Prakashan, Pulchowk, KATHMANDU.

NETHERLANDS: Roodvelt Import b.v., Brouwersgracht 288, 1013 HG AMSTERDAM, tel.: (020) 622 80 35, fax: (020) 625 54 93; **INOR Publikaties**, M. A. de Ruyterstraat 20 a, Postbus 202, 7480 AE HAAKSBERGEN, tel.: (315) 42 74 00 04, fax· (315) 42 72 92 96. *For periodicals*: **Faxon-Europe**, Postbus 197, 1000 AD AMSTERDAM, **Kooyker Booksellers**, P.O Box 24, 2300 AA LEIDEN, tel : (071) 16 05 60, fax· (071) 14 44 39

NETHERLANDS ANTILLES: Van Dorp-Eddine N.V., P.O. Box 3001, Willemstad, CURAÇAO

NEW ZEALAND: GP Legislation Services, 10 Mulgrove Street, P.O. Box 12418, Thorndon, WELLINGTON, tel.: 496 56 55, fax: (644) 496 56 98. *Retail bookshops*. Housing Corporation Bldg, 25 Rutland Street, PO Box 5513 Wellesley Street, AUCKLAND, tel · (09) 309 53 61, fax: (649) 307 21 37; 147 Hereford Street, Private Bag, CHRISTCHURCH, tel.: (03) 79 71 42, fax: (643) 77 25 29; Cargill House, 123 Princes Street, P.O Box 1104, DUNEDIN, tel.: (03) 477 82 94, fax: (643) 477 78 69; 33 King Street, P.O. Bax 857, HAMILTON, tel.. (07) 846 06 06, fax: (647) 846 65 66; 38-42 Broadway Ave., P.O Box 138, PALMERSTON NORTH

NIGERIA: UNESCO Sub-Regional Office, 9 Bankole Oki Road, Oft. Mobolaji Johnson Avenue, Ikoyi, P.O. Box 2823, LAGOS, tel.: 68 30 87, 68 40 37, fax: (234-1) 269 37 58; **Obafemi Awolowo University**, ILE IFE; **The University Bookshop of Ibadan**, P.O. Box 286, IBADAN; **The University Bookshop of Nsukka**; **The University Bookshop of Lagos**; **The Ahmadu Bello University Bookshop of Zaria**.

NORWAY: Akademika A/S, Universitetsbokhandel, P.O. Box 84, BLINDERN 0314, Oslo 3, tel : 22 85 30 00, fax: 22 85 30 53; **Narvesen Info Center**, P.O. Box 6125, Etterstad, 06002 OSLO, tel.: 225 73 300, tax. 226 81 901.

PAKISTAN: Mirza Book Agency, 65 Shahrah Quaid-E-Azam, P.O Box 729, LAHORE 54000, tel.: 66839, telex: 4886 ubplk; **UNESCO Publications Centre**, Regional Office for Book Development in Asia and the Pacific, P.O. Box 2034A, ISLAMABAD, tel.: 82 20 71/9, fax: (9251) 21 39 59, 82 27 96.

PHILIPPINES: International Book Center (Philippines), Suite 1703, Cityland 10, Condominium Tower 1, Ayala Ave , corner H.V. Dela Costa Ext., Makati, METRO MANILA, tel.: 817 96 76, fax: (632) 817 17 41.

POLAND: ORPAN-Import, Palac Kultury, 00-901 WARSZAWA, **Ars Polona-Ruch**, Krakowskie Przedmiescie 7, 00-068 WARSZAWA.

QATAR: UNESCO Regional Office in the Arab States of the Gulf, P.O. Box 3945, DOHA, tel.: 86 77 07/08, fax: (974) 86 76 44.

RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Mezhdunarodnaja Kniga, Ul. Dimitrova 39, MOSKVA 113095.

SAINT VINCENT AND THE GRENADINES: Young Workers' Creative Organization, Blue Caribbean Building, 2nd Floor, Room 12, KINGSTOWN.

SEYCHELLES: National Bookshop, P.O. Box 48, MAHÉ.

SINGAPORE: Chopmen Publishers, 865 Mountbatten Road, No. 05-28/29, Katong Shopping Centre, SINGAPORE 1543, fax: (65) 344 01 80; **Select Books Pte Ltd,** 19 Tanglin Road No. 3-15, Tanglin Shopping Centre, SINGAPORE 1024, tel.. 732 15 15, fax: (65) 736 08 55

SLOVAKIA: Alfa Verlag, Hurbanovo nam. 6, 893-31 BRATISLAVA.

SLOVENIA: Cancarjeva Zalozba, Kopitarjeva 2, P.O. Box 201-IV, 61001 LJUBLJANA.

SOMALIA: Modern Book Shop and General, P.O. Box 951, MOGADISCIO.

SOUTH AFRICA: Van Schaik Bookstore (Pty) Ltd, P.O. Box 2355, BELLVILLE 7530.

SRI LANKA: Lake House Bookshop, 100 Sir Chittampalam Gardiner Mawata, P.O. Box 244, COLOMBO 2, fax: (94-1) 43 21 04.

SURINAME: Suriname National Commission for UNESCO, P.O. Box 3017, PARAMARIBO, tel.: (597) 618 65, 46 18 71, fax: (597) 49 50 83 (attn. UNESCO Nat. Com).

SWEDEN: Fritzes Informations Center, Regeringsgatan 12, S-106 47 STOCKHOLM, tel : 468-690 90 90, fax: 468-20 50 21. *For periodicals*: **Wennergren-Williams Informationsservice,** Box 1305, S-171 25 SOLNA, tel.: 468-705 97 50, fax: 468-27 00 71; **Tidskriftscentralen,** Subscription Services, Norrtullsgatan 15, S-102 32 STOCKHOLM, tel.: 468-31 20 90, fax: 468-30 13 35.

SWITZERLAND: ADECO, Case postale 465, CH-1211 GENÈVE 19, tel.: (021) 943 26 73, fax: (021) 943 36 05; **Europa Verlag,** Ramistrasse 5, CH-8024 ZURICH, tel.: 261 16 29; **United Nations Bookshop** (counter service only), Palais des Nations, CH-1211 GENEVE 10, tel.: 740 09 21, fax: (4122) 917 00 27. *For periodicals*: **Naville S.A.,** 7, rue Lévrier, CH-1201 GENEVE.

THAILAND: UNESCO Principal Regional Office in Asia and the Pacific (PROAP), Prakanong Post Office, Box 967, BANGKOK 10110, tel.: 391 08 80, fax. (662) 391 08 66; **Suksapan Panit,** Mansion 9, Rajdamnern Avenue, BANGKOK 14, tel.: 281 65 53, 282 78 22, fax: (662) 281 49 47; **Nibondh & Co. Ltd,** 40-42 Charoen Krung Road, Siyaeg Phaya Sri, P.O. Box 402, BANGKOK G.P.O., tel.: 221 26 11, fax: 224 68 89; **Suksit Siam Company,** 113-115 Fuang Nakhon Road, opp. Wat Rajbopith, BANGKOK 10200, fax: (662) 222 51 88

TRINIDAD AND TOBAGO: Trinidad and Tobago National Commission for UNESCO, Ministry of Education, 8 Elizabeth Street, St Clair, PORT OF SPAIN, tel./fax: (1809) 622 09 39.

TURKEY: Haset Kitapevi A.S., Istiklâl Caddesi No. 469, Posta Kutusu 219, Bevoglu, ISTANBUL.

UGANDA: Uganda Bookshop, P.O. Box 7145, KAMPALA.

UNITED ARAB EMIRATES: Al Mutanabbi Bookshop, P.O. Box 71946, ABU DHABI, tel.: 32 59 20, 34 03 19, fax: (9712) 31 77 06; **Al Batra Bookshop,** P.O. Box 21235, SHARJAH, tel.: (971-6) 54 72 25.

UNITED KINGDOM: HMSO Publications Centre, P.O. Box 276, LONDON SW8 5DT, fax: 071-873 2000; *telephone orders only*: 071-873 9090; *general inquiries*: 071-873 0011 (queuing system in operation). *HMSO bookshops*: 49 High Holborn, LONDON WC1V 6HB, tel. 071-873 0011 (*counter service only*); 71 Lothian Road, EDINBURGH EH3 9AZ, tel. 031-228 4181; 16 Arthur Street, BELFAST BT1 4GD, tel. 023-223 8451; 9-21 Princess Street, Albert Square, MANCHESTER M60 8AS, tel. 061-834 7201; 258 Broad Street, BIRMINGHAM B1 2HE, tel. 021-643 3740; Southey House, Wine Street, BRISTOL BS1 2BQ, tel. 027-226 4306. *For scientific maps*: McCarta Ltd, 15 Highbury Place, LONDON N5 1QP; GeoPubs (Geoscience Publications Services), 43 Lammas Way, AMPTHILL, MK45 2TR, tel.: 0525-40 58 14, fax: 0525-40 53 76.

UNITED REPUBLIC OF TANZANIA: Dar es Salaam Bookshop, P.O. Box 9030, DAR ES SALAAM.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: UNIPUB, 4611-F Assembly Drive, LANHAM, MD 20706-4391, tel. toll-free: 1-800-274-4888, fax. (301) 459-0056; **United Nations Bookshop,** NEW YORK, NY 10017, tel.: (212) 963-7680, fax: (212) 963-4970.

VENEZUELA: Oficina de la UNESCO en Caracas, Av. Los Chorros Cruce c/ Acueducto, Edificio Asovincar, Altos de Sebucán, CARACAS, tel.: (2) 286 21 56, fax: (58-2) 286 03 26; **Librería del Este,** Av Francisco de Miranda 52, Edificio Galipán, Apartado 60337, CARACAS 1060-A; **Editorial Ateneo de Caracas,** Apartado 662, Caracas 10010; Fundación Kuai-Mare del Libro Venezolano, Calle Hípica con Avenida La Guairita, Edificio Kuai-Mare, Las Mercedes, CARACAS, tel.: (02) 92 05 46, 91 94 01, fax: (582) 92 65 34.

YUGOSLAVIA: Nolit, Terazije 13/VIII, 11000 BEOGRAD.

ZAMBIA: National Educational Distribution Co. of Zambia Ltd, P.O. Box 2664, LUSAKA.

ZIMBABWE: Textbook Sales (Pvt) Ltd, 67 Union Avenue, HARARE; Grassroots Books (Pvt) Ltd, Box A267, HARARE.

A complete list of all the national distributors can be obtained on request from: Promotion and Sales Division, UNESCO Publishing, UNESCO, 7, place de Fontenoy, 75352 PARIS 07 SP, France, fax: (1) 42 73 30 07, telex: 204461 Paris.

UNESCO BOOK COUPONS can be used to purchase all books and periodicals of an educational, scientific or cultural character. For full information, please write to: UNESCO Coupon Office, UNESCO, 7, place de Fontenoy, 75352 PARIS 07 SP (France).

Too often, when people speak of the 'founders of education' they have in mind only the thinkers and pedagogues who, in the West and elsewhere, have devoted themselves to education to the exclusion of all else: in short, education as a game preserve or private fief. Yet philosophers, politicians, sociologists, scientists, theologians, novelists, historians, poets and essayists, of every period and culture, have had much to say on the subject of education.

How is one then to understand in depth, through its successive strata, the philosophy that underlies a particular system of education if, beyond the play of fashion, the surface eddies and the ups and downs of politics, one knows little or nothing about the thinkers who inspired it?

Clearly, there is a need to fill a gap by bringing together in a single work monographs presenting and appraising, in our own terms and with the tools available to us today, the great figures who, in one way or another, have left their mark on educational thought.

This is the third volume in the four-volume series of 100 essays written by internationally, regionally or nationally recognized specialists, who are perfectly familiar with and have direct access to the work of the educator in question.

Far off, in terms of time, the most ancient of the authors studied is Confucius; in our own day, figures still very much alive continue to animate, directly or indirectly, the universal debate on education. In the intervening period, as we progress through these pages, twenty-five centuries will elapse.

As regards geographical space, the reader will come to know China, Japan, India, the Near and Middle East, North Africa, Greece, the Balkans, as well as all parts of Europe, including Russia – and the former USSR. We will have touched down in Africa and made stopovers in Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Cuba, Mexico, Uruguay and Venezuela before reaching the United States.

To speak of travelling in space and time is also to speak of an exploration of religions, cultures and ideologies, and the circumnavigation of political regimes of every description.

ISSN 0033-1538

UNESCO